EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
University of Toronto

https://archive.org/details/empireclubofcana1928unse

ROBERT FENNELL

PRESIDENT OF THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA, 1928

EMPIRE CLUB
OF
CANADA

ADDRESSES DELIVERED TO THE
MEMBERS DURING THE YEAR 1928

Twenty-sixth Year of Issue

GOD SAVE THE KING

TORONTO
THE HUNTER-ROSE CO., LIMITED
1929

Copyright, Canada, 1929
THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

Press of The Hunter-Rose Co., Limited

CONTENTS

PAGE

FRONTISPIECE ii

AFFILIATION WITH THE ROYAL EMPIRE SOCIETY vii

OFFICERS 1928 viii

PREFATORY NOTE x

ADDRESSES :

IMPERIAL CO-OPERATION 1
RIGHT HONOURABLE L. C. S. M. AMERY, M.P., ETC., ETC.

THE ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE IN THE ARCTIC 11
CAPTAIN HOWARD STEELE, M.C.

INTERNATIONAL TRADING IN GRAIN 30
ROBERT MAGILL, M.A., PH.D.

THOMAS HARDY 38
PROFESSOR PELHAM EDGAR, PH.D.

HUMOUR 47
MR. SEYMOUR-HICKS.

THE NINETEEN TWENTY-EIGHT BUDGET 56
MR. BERNARD K. SANDWELL, F.R.S.C.

THE ASSAULT ON EVEREST 69
MR. N. E. ODELL, A.R.S.M., F.G.S., ETC.

A SANE SCHEME OF COLONIZATION 83
MR. C. A. MAGRATH, M.E.I.C.

THE ST. LAWRENCE DEEP WATERWAY PROJECT 95
PROFESSOR W. A. GOFORTH, MONTREAL.

THE INFLUENCE OF MUSIC ON THE COMMUNITY 110
MR. EDWARD BRANSCOMBE.

ENERGY AND COMMON SENSE IN EDUCATION AND EMPIRE 125
MR. ARTHUR ROWNTREE.

WORLD POLITICS OF CANADA AND THE EMPIRE 133
DR. H. F. MUNRO, HALIFAX, N.S.

OUR RESPONSIBILITY TO THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING THEATRE 144
MR. CLAYTON HAMILTON.

What is to Become of China? 157
RT. REV. W. C. WHITE, HONAN.

Good Citizenship 173
BRIG.-GEN. D. G. DRAPER, C.M.G., D.S.O.

Overseas Settlement 179
MAJ.-GEN. THE RIGHT HON. LORD LOVAT, K.T., ETC., ETC.

Industrial Conditions in The Home Land 185
RIGHT HON. H. P. MACMILLAN, P.C., K.C.

Conditions in Britain and Europe 197
HON. G. HOWARD FERGUSON, K.C., M.P.P., ETC.

A Gilbert and Sullivan Repertoire 210
MR. FREDERIC HOBBS, AND THE D'OYLY CARTE OPERA COMPANY.

Canada's Immigration Problems 213
RIGHT HON. SIR THOMAS WHITE, K.C.M.G.

Abolishing the Arctic 225
VILHJALMUR STEFANSSON, M.A., LL.D.

Patriotism and Poetry 235
SIR HAROLD E. BOULTON, BART., ETC.

France and Canada 242
HIS EXCELLENCY DR. PAUL CLAUDEL, D.S.P., LL.D.

Our Trade Channels 245
WILLIAM H. MOORE, LL.D.

The Old Romance of Canada 256
MR. JOHN NELSON, MONTREAL.

St. Lawrence Waterway Scheme 270
HON. SENATOR GEORGE LYNCH-STAUNTON, K.C.

The Salmon Industry 282
HON. JOHN HALL KELLY, K.C.

Appendix I. Report of the Annual Meeting 295
" II. Honorary Presidents and Past Presidents of the Club 299
" III. Constitution and Ordinances of the Empire Club 300

THE ROYAL EMPIRE SOCIETY
AND
THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

The Royal Empire Society and the Empire Club of Canada are affiliated with a view to promote mutually the object for which both were founded, namely, the Unity of the Empire. Each extends to visitors and members vouched for by the other the usual courtesy on arrival in London or Toronto.

THE ROYAL EMPIRE SOCIETY
AND
THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA

The Royal Empire Society and the Empire Club of Canada are affiliated with a view to promote mutually the object for which both were founded, namely, the Unity of the Empire. Each extends to visitors and members vouched for by the other the usual courtesies on arrival in London or Toronto.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE

YEAR 1928

Patron:

FIELD MARSHALL H.R.H. THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT
AND STRATHEARN, K.G., G.C.M.G., etc.

Honorary President:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE VISCOUNT WILLINGDON, G.C.S.I.
G.C.M.G., G.C.I.E., G.B.E., etc.

President : Robert Fennell, Esq.
First Vice-President : Colonel Henry Brock
Second Vice-President : Claude A. C. Jennings, Esq.
Third Vice-President : Colonel C. W. Rowley
Secretary-Treasurer : H. G. Stapells, Esq., M.A.

Committee :

Mr. K. J. Dunstan
Mr. E. H. Wilkinson
Mr. S. J. Frame
Mr. Hugh S. Eayrs
Mr. Charles V. Syrett
Mr. William Tyrell
Col. Baptist Johnston
Mr. R. P. Baker
Mr. G. C. Bateman
Mr. F. B. Fetherstonhaugh
Mr. J. D. Spence
Mr. W. J. Darby
Mr. Horace Hunter
Mr. H. T. Jamieson
Major T. Crawford Brown
Col. B. O. Hooper
Mr. Charles P. Tisdall

Colonel Alexander Fraser, LL.D., *Immediate Past President.*

Dr. R. N. Burns F. J. Coombs Colonel A. E. Kirkpatrick	*Representing the Past-Presidents.*

PREFATORY NOTE

It is but re-voicing the apt words of the Secretary, Mr. Stapells, in his Annual Report to say that the year 1928, was of exceptional interest in the affairs of the Club. The members manifested a keenness in the addresses delivered at the weekly luncheons and the press was generous in the matter of space. From both of these facts there is reason to believe that valuable information was disseminated which made a favourable impression on the people.

The opening address by Colonel Amery was a timely utterance on Imperial Co-Operation. It was an address such as only the Secretary of State for the Overseas Dominions could give. Not only has he given a life study to Imperial conditions, but at the time of his appearance before the Club he was returning home to England from a long journey, having for its object the gaining of first-hand information on affairs of Empire import. His speech before the Club will remain as a rare example of the importance of intensive study of Empire history, and personal travel by members of the British Government.

A thoughtful address on Colonization was given by Mr. C. A. Magrath, who spoke from practical experience of prairie settlement. His views have attracted attention and his address has been regarded as a suggestive contribution to a live and difficult subject.

On the same theme, Sir Thomas White expressed himself later on bringing out not only the result of wide study, but of responsible, administrative experience as an ex-Minister of Finance of Canada. These two addresses will be taken as somewhat complementary of each other and as useful deliverance by outstanding public men.

One of the most interesting incidents of the year was the visit of Lord Lovat, Under-Secretary of State for Overseas Dominions in the Imperial Government. He had set out on a journey around the Empire to learn for himself the conditions existing in the several great Dominions, under his administration, with the ultimate view of promoting co-operation in matters of Settlement, Trade, Commerce and matters of mutual concern to the Homeland and the Overseas parts of the Empire. He travelled minutely through Canada, addressed many meetings, met public men everywhere and made a most favourable impression. His Address to the Empire Club is an indication of the point of view of his Government.

While Lord Lovat was thus gaining useful information concerning Canada, The Honourable G. Howard Ferguson, Prime Minister of Ontario, on the other hand, shortly afterwards, gave an Address of great interest on "Conditions in Britain and Europe" in which he had been an observant visitor during the summer months, studying the trend of affairs in France, Germany, Switzerland, Denmark, Holland, Sweden and Norway. His impressions formed in the course of his journeyings proved to be most interesting and will be read with pleasure and profit in this volume.

Mr. Ferguson took advantage of the occasion to present a Union Jack to the Club on behalf of the Royal Empire Society, which was sent and received as a recognition by the Society of the excellent work carried on by our Club. In this connection it may be mentioned that the Society had applied for a set of the Volumes of the Speeches published annually by the Club, for its library, and in return for these volumes which were greatly appreciated, the fine Union Jack was sent by the hand of Ontario's Prime Minister.

In the course of the year, Mr. Sammon, Secretary of the Royal Colonial Institute, now the Royal Empire

Society, visited Canada for the purpose of bringing the objects of the Society to the notice of the Canadian public, the result being a substantial increase in the membership of the Society.

The Club parts with regret with Mr. Stapells as Secretary. He served during four momentous years in its history. The best wishes of the whole membership go with him on what is hoped will be a long and successful career in the profession of the law.

ALEXANDER FRASER,
Chairman, Editorial Committee.

IMPERIAL CO-OPERATION

An Address by THE RIGHT HONOURABLE L. C. S. M. AMERY, M.P., Secretary of State for Overseas Dominions, etc.

19th January, 1928.

The distinguished speaker was introduced by the President, Mr. Robert Fennell, as the third of the "Imperial Ambassadors" who had recently visited Toronto,—the Prince of Wales, Mr. Stanley Baldwin, Prime Minister of Great Britain, being the other two who had preceded him with messages of good-will to the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. Amery who was warmly received said: You have spoken of my coming on an Embassy of Empire. Well, where else should I go on such an Embassy than to Toronto—the very heart and centre of Imperial sentiment? I know well how keen is Toronto's interest in Imperial questions. I had the privilege of attending gatherings of this great Club many years ago, and it is only eight years since I listened in this very room to the still vigorous and passionate eloquence of my old friend Colonel Denison, speaking on the whole subject of Imperial relations, and indeed of Canada's relations to her southern neighbour, with that impulsive frankness of speech which never failed him. This City and this Club are indeed repositories of a great Imperial tradition. But they are not alone in that, for Canada herself, as a nation, is the repository of a great Imperial tradition which she has played a part in shaping.

It seems to me that it is impossible to separate the growth of Canada's national life from the development of the British Empire. Her very birth was the assertion of a determination that the British Empire had not come to an end when the thirteen old American colonies broke away from the Mother-country. That great separation of the peoples of British stock belongs to history. We can judge it with the detachment and impartiality of history. But I believe that history, in an ever growing measure, will do justice to those who tried to avert the breach—not only to men like Burke, who in the old country counselled a more tolerant, a more understanding attitude towards the difficulties which the young colonies created, but also to those American loyalists who, loving freedom just as much as their revolutionary fellow-countrymen—and their descendants have shown it since—also believed in the value of unity and in the importance of preserving the great heritage of tradition which united the Colonies to the Mother-land. And when impatience on both sides triumphed over statesmanship, and the breach became irreparable, did those who believed in the combination of Empire and freedom despair? On our side of the Atlantic we set to work again. If we had staked our all on a disastrous game of pitch and toss, we began again at the beginning and never breathed a word of our loss, but proceeded to build up once more a new Empire all over the world, destined to become even greater than the Empire which had separated itself from us.

Here on this continent those to whom the principles of unity, the love of the old flag, the faith in the old traditions were no less sacred and precious than the freedom which they also valued—they, too, set out in faith to build up a new home for themselves in the forest wilderness which stood where Toronto now stands, and in the woods and among the lakes of Nova Scotia, and laid the beginnings of a great British dominion in Canada. How great their faith was it is difficult for us to realise.

It was almost more of an instinct than any conscious realisation of how Canada was destined to develop in future years. A handful of settlers in the wilderness here, separated by another handful of French Canadian settlers, with vast tracts of forest and muskeg between, from another little handful in what is now the Maritime Provinces. And yet that little handful of men carried with them a torch which has burned more brightly ever since.

It would be very interesting if some student of Imperial affairs ever took the trouble to trace the influence of the United Empire Loyalists and their descendants, and those who carried on their traditions, upon the whole conception of a united Empire in Great Britain. There can be no doubt that men like Joseph Howe, Sir J. A. Macdonald, Sir Charles Tupper, George Parkin, had great influence in shaping thought in the old country in the last generation. To take a single man—very long your fellow-citizen here—Dr. Parkin. He was, I believe, mainly instrumental in first interesting in Empire problems a great statesman recently lost to us, Lord Milner, one who has played in our time as great a part as any man both in the actual conduct of Imperial affairs and in the shaping of our ideas on Imperial problems. I well remember the deep impression which a lecture of Dr. Parkin's made on me as a small boy at Harrow. Take another instance. Take Mr. Chamberlain, who, with Lord Milner did more than any other man to shape Imperial thought in Britain in recent years. I know how profound was the influence upon his mind of his visit to Canada, and particularly to Toronto, in the early eighties. It would be interesting to trace the influence of the United Empire Loyalist tradition, through all its ramifications, upon the whole growth of sentiment throughout the British Empire. And from those days onwards, and even before, at every stage Canada has taken the lead in the development of those conceptions upon which the new British Empire is built.

The Quebec Act, which immediately preceded it, was in no small measure responsible for the American Revolution. Its acceptance of equal rights for the religion and the race of His Majesty's French Canadian subjects was at the moment a grievous stone of offence in the eyes of New England. The Quebec Act was a great landmark in the history of the new Empire, because it opened a new chapter by making it clear that the British Empire of today is built not on racial exclusion but upon toleration. Its foundation is not only freedom for the individual but freedom within it for communities, for nations, for creeds and for languages. That is one great landmark which characterises the British Empire of today, with its infinite diversity, from the more uniform and homogeneous structure of the great American Republic.

Take another, and perhaps the greatest, landmark of all—responsible government. The foundations of responsible government were laid down, its principles first enunciated, in that great report of Lord Durham's which he penned here in contact with the atmosphere of Canada, realising that freedom and equality, trust in His Majesty's subjects wherever they may live, need not mean separation, but in the long run mean closer unity. The seed sown here in Canada spread over the whole Empire, and responsible government to every people of our race throughout the Empire. By slow stages, as conditions make it possible, it is spreading, too, to other subjects of the King, who belong to different races, and have an entirely different history and tradition behind them. No easy task of adjustment, whether in India or anywhere else, it is still a great ideal to fulfil, and one which, in one shape or another, we shall fulfil in the course of time. (Hear,hear.)

Take another great landmark of Empire—Confederation. The idea that scattered British colonies could be united into one great federation, following in one sense the American model, but with the very opposite object —with the object of strengthening their union with the rest of the Empire, strengthening their position in the Empire—that great conception was Canada's. There again, in Australia, in South Africa, the Canadian example was followed, and other great British nations have come, or are coming, into existence, based on the same principles of national development, national individuality, national freedom, coupled with a sense of Imperial unity and Imperial responsibility.

Even in the dependent Empire—in East Africa, in the West Indies and elsewhere—that conception of a wider grouping, first inspired by Canada, is taking shape. Indeed one, and not the least effect of Confederation in its early days was to lead to the belief that in some form or other the same federal principles could be successfully applied to the Empire at large; and as some of you will remember, Canadian Confederation was followed for two or three decades by a strong movement throughout the Empire on the part of keen students and thinkers in favour of some scheme of Imperial Federation. Contact with the realities of the problem, contact with the growing national life in each Dominion, with the immense distances which separate us, with the difficulty of ever really arriving at any division of functions which would not at the same time be both irksome and embarrassing to the free development of national life, and yet not at the same time also be far too narrow to cover the whole field within which we wish to, and must, work together, led to the gradual abandonment of that idea as unpractical, at any rate in our day and in the existing conditions of the world, and substituted for it the idea of consultation and co-operation.

Here, too, Canada has played a very leading part. Twenty-four years ago the Imperial Conference met for the first time—and I do not see why it should be the last time—at Ottawa. That Conference laid the foundation-stone of great developments in Imperial co-operation. It was at that Conference that, Britain alone dissenting, the self-governing Colonies and the Dominion of Canada agreed upon resolutions in favour of some system of Imperial Preference; and to those resolutions Sir Wilfred Laurier gave practical effect three years later when Canada initiated her first preferential tariff—a preference then unreciprocated, but gradually reciprocated in a wider measure throughout the Empire, and today being reciprocated, at any rate to the extent to which we do impose duties, to Canada by Great Britain on every article on which we have a duty.

That same Conference also laid the seeds, thanks to the unwearied enthusiasm and persistence of Sir Sanford Fleming, of the construction of a great link of Empire communication, the Pacific Cable, which for more than a generation has helped in the task of keeping the Empire together, and carried us to these days in which newer forms of communication are, I believe, destined to bring us closer yet.

In all these fields Canada has been a leader; and so too, in the last stage of development which culminated in the Imperial Conference of last year. In one sense that Conference was simply a final carrying out of the principles embodied in Lord Durham's report. In another sense it was more particularly the culmination of that desire to express more clearly the full nationhood of the Dominions which voiced itself first at the Imperial Conference in 1917, and through successive stages at the Peace negotiations in Paris, at the meetings of the Imperial War Cabinet in 1917 and 1918, in the establishment of the League of Nations. All that has followed since was largely brought about by the guidance and through the influence of Canada's representatives—Sir Robert Borden in the earlier years, and Mr. Mackenzie King during the negotiations of a year ago. Throughout that development it was not a case of an insistence from Canada which Great Britain or other Dominions demurred to. It was a case of a progress as to the desirability of which we were all in agreement and all unanimous.

Now today that great stage of evolution of our young Empire which began with Lord Durham's report has reached completion. But let us look back over the chapter. At every stage in that chapter the growth of national sentiment and of national life in Canada has been indissolubly bound up with the growth and the deepening of the sentiment of Imperial unity. (Hear, hear, and applause). Every great struggle in which Canada has been engaged, the fight against the invader, when British and French Canadians fought side by side, at Queenston, at Chateauguay, or wherever it may have been, was the beginning of a common Canadian nationality. The South African War was followed by a keener realisation of Canada's national individuality and character. No less obvious to those who studied the situation was the strength of the Imperial sentiment that sent

Canadians across the seas to South Africa. The same was true in the Great War. Who could disentangle the effect of the Great War, both in heightening Canada's sense of her own personality, her own individuality as a nation, and on the other hand her sense of the inseparable, the unseverable, bonds that join us all together? (Loud applause.)

It was the same in her political development. Self-government came to Canada not as a step to separation, but as clearing the way for a truer unity. Confederation was intended by its founders to make of Canada a nation, but a nation within the Empire, an Imperial nation; and that, I believe, in even greater measure will prove to be the consequence of the conclusions to which we came just over a year ago. I know that to some those conclusions seemed dangerous. It seemed as if, in our desire to asseverate formal equality and unlimited freedom we were loosening bonds that still had value in keeping the Empire together. I doubt if we loosened anything that for a generation past had had any real influence compared to the essential things that bind us together. Those essential things are summed up in our allegiance to the same Crown, which was affirmed as clearly and as emphatically in those resolutions as was the freedom which we each enjoy.

And now I would ask—If it be true that we now enjoy, each of us, a freedom which would make separation easy if we willed it, are we really likely to make use of our freedom for such an end? Is Great Britain, who has shown in every direction, I venture to say, in recent years a greater sense of her Imperial responsibilities, who has shaped her foreign policy more and more from the point of view of realising the interests, the attitude, the ideas of the rest of the Empire, who is coming round from her old attitude of economic isolation, or economic internationalism—I think the former is the truer word in fact—to realising that her economic future depends upon co-operation with the rest of the Empire, is she likely to make use of this formal liberty assigned to her in order to forget all her past?—in order to throw off that responsibility for the maintenance of Imperial unity, for the development of the whole, which is in fact emphasised by the resolutions of the Conference? I think not.

Well, if that is the case with Great Britain, what about Canada? Is Canada any more likely than Great Britain suddenly to go back on the whole of her history—a history where the growth of freedom and responsibility has gone side by side from the very first step with a keener sense of Imperial responsibility and Imperial unity? Is Canada going to be less of an Imperial nation in the future when her full Imperial status has been recognised as equal to that of Great Britain? For, remember, the status recognised as due to the Dominions by the Imperial Conference is not the status of ordinary common nations; it is the status of equal freedom with Great-Britain, and Britain is no ordinary or common nation. She is a nation truly Imperial in virtue of her history, in virtue of the mighty part she has played in the world, in virtue, above all, of her sense of responsibility towards the great Empire of which she is part, and so through that Empire, to humanity at large. (Applause.)

After all, service to others and a sense of responsibility are as essential a part in the greatness of a nation as they are in the moral development of the individual; and there is all the difference in the world between some little nation, nominally independent, but living in perpetual fear of its neighbours, living in covetous desire of its neighbour's territories perhaps, living in a narrow circle, thinking only of a limited class of interests, with little responsibility for anything outside itself, and a great Imperial nation. Now, the status which Canada has reached is not the status of one of these lesser nations it is the status which Britain herself holds—the status of a responsible equal partner in the great British Commonwealth.

Well, then, I would ask—Is it likely that Canada in the future is going to go back upon her own history, close herself into a narrow circle of irresponsibility, contract her outlook, narrow her patriotism? On the contrary, I believe that in the shaping of the Empire of the future, an Empire whose wonderful possibilities we are only just beginning to descry, whose power for good influence in the world we are only just beginning to realize—that in that development Canada will take at least as dominant and leading a part as she has taken in the development of the Empire in the past. (Hear, hear, and applause.)

Great Britain may be an old country in one sense, an old country full of great traditions: but we also believe we are still a young country full of initiative, full of vigor, still able, as that Conference showed, to adjust our minds to the developments of the Empire and of the world; and we are not by any means ready yet to abandon the tasks of Empire, to throw up the sponge and say that we are finished. But we do realize, and we are proud to realize, that in an ever-widening and growing task there are younger partners who will shoulder that task with us—partners who share our great traditions and have never separated from them; partners who are even younger in spirit, it may be, than ourselves, partners whose resources are infinitely greater than ours, and who may—who knows?—in the fulness of time play an even greater part in the partnership as a whole than we do ourselves.

These are the things of the future that no one can predict. Certainly in the economic sphere it seems to me that Canada is almost inevitably destined, by the character of her great resources, and the great external trade, to develop, to play a leading part in the building up of the frame-work of economic co-operation. Be that as it may, one thing that is clear to my mind—and I speak as one who comes from outside and looks at Canada, looks at her history as it was, looks at Canada as she is to-day—I can conceive even in a series of brief visits how Canada is going to develop. I have no doubt whatever that Canada will develop along the lines of her own personality—based on racial equality and toleration, based on freedom, based on faith in the British Empire and in co-operation. And there, I believe, the greatness of her destiny knows practically no limit. (Applause.)

Sir James Woods voiced the thanks of the Club to the speaker for his inspiring address.

THE ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE IN THE ARCTIC

AN ADDRESS BY CAPTAIN HOWARD STEELE, M.C.,

26th January, 1928

The President introduced the lecturer who said: The subject of my address on this occasion, refers to what is probably the least known of all the activities of the present Force, formerly The Royal North-West Mounted Police. I am going to try to dispel some of this ignorance. To begin with, the Mounted Police have been in the Arctic or sub-Arctic since 1894, when the first detachment was sent to the Yukon just before the great gold rush. The question arises, why were they sent there and why are they there now?—and the answer is bound up with the greatest story of exploration in the world's history, the search for the North-West Passage.

This is a British Story. More money and more lives were expended by British subjects in the search for the North-West Passage than were expended in the same object by the rest of the world put together. Of the twenty-seven islands of the Canadian Arctic Archipelago having an area of over three hundred square miles, all but three were discovered, claimed for the British Empire, and in the main explored and charted by British subjects. The three exceptions were discovered by a Norwegian expedition and have since been acknowledged by Norway as part of Canada's heritage in the Arctic. In fact, one might say that the Canadian Arctic Archipelago was painted red in the life blood of British seamen and adventurers, and that the Franklin cenotaph, erected on Beechey Island to the memory of Sir John Franklin and his men, forms the foundation stone of Canada's dominion in the far north. The names of some of the greatest explorers in history—Franklin, McClintock, Parry (not Peary but Captain Sir William Edward

Parry), are associated with the search for the North-West Passage. And it is because of these men that the Mounted Police are up there now, in the cold and the darkness of the Polar night, keeping the flag still flying. When Canada became a Dominion Great Britain handed over all that territory to be held in trust for the British Empire by us. It took three hundred years to discover the North-West Passage. It still takes from two to three years to sail through it. Today its course is dotted with Royal Canadian Mounted Police detachments and we can make the journey in imagination in a few minutes, as we will do presently, after taking a little run up to the most northerly detachments. None the less, we should never forget that it took three hundred years of tragic and heroic effort to win the Arctic for Canada.

One reason why the Mounted Police are stationed in the Arctic is because the area is not a worthless waste, but is very rich in valuable animal life and shows signs of potential mineral wealth. Then, the Arctic Islands will probably have a useful future as air bases. The leading aviation authorities of the world are agreed that, when Europe, Asia and America are linked by intercontinental air routes, many of these routes will lie across the Polar Basin, straight across the North Pole, because these are the shortest and most logical lines to follow. When that time comes bases at which the air liners can replenish will be required in the Arctic and these islands will then become of first-class importance. I can quote you figures to illustrate the present value of the Arctic to Canada and the material benefit derived by this country from the presence there of the Mounted Police. For instance, $150,000 in duties and fees were collected by the Force in the Yukon in 1898, during the Great Gold Rush. The Yukon is in the Arctic or sub-Arctic regions:—then in one year recently, in 1926, $28,000 in customs duties and $10,000 in income tax were collected at one small detachment alone —Herschel Island, the most westerly of all the northern detachments. About ten percent. of the entire Force, or approximately one hundred all ranks, are assigned to duty in this enormous area, which is in the form of a triangle bounded roughly on the south by the 55th parallel of north latitude, on the east by a line drawn up Baffin Bay midway between Greenland and Ellesmere Island as far as the north pole and on the west by the 141st meridian, which forms the boundary between Alaska and the Yukon Territory, also continued to the pole. Canada does not claim the pole itself but claims everything up to it. This triangle is as large as Europe minus Russia. The area of the Arctic Islands alone exceeds 535,000 square miles, which is approximately equal to the combined areas of Alberta and Saskatchewan. It is very thinly populated, having only about 15,000 people, Eskimos, Indians, trappers, missionaries and prospectors and traders. Even the most densely populated area, the MacKenzie River District, contains only 1–96th of a person to the square mile!

The men of the Mounted Police in that area are dotted over it in detachments of two or three men, as far north as Bache Peninsula, within eleven degrees of the pole, where they occupy the most northerly habitation on earth. Every detachment is a pocket government in itself, the Sergeant or Corporal in charge having the powers of a postmaster, gamewarden, justice of the peace, and in fact, all the authority necessary to enable him to represent the government. These detachments remain in the Arctic all the year round, year in and year out, constantly attending to their arduous duties.

The duties of a detachment may be briefly summarized as follows: to protect and assist the natives and the whites, to enforce the Federal laws and to carry out scientific investigation for the government. This work is accomplished largely by means of the patrols. Setting out with dogs or in boats, they periodically undertake long journeys, sometimes to investigate an alleged crime but often merely to remind the people of their presence in the country. This is where the dog teams come in—in fact without the husky these patrols would be impossible. The dog, whose picture you see shown here, has a remarkable record. His name is

"Mountie" and, though he is now enjoying a well-earned rest at the C. P. R. Hotel in Quebec, the Chateau Frontenac, he served five years with the Mounted Police in the north, covering eight thousand miles on the trail during that time, while, according to his driver, he was never a day off duty and never missed a patrol.

The secret of the success achieved by the Force in the Arctic lies largely in the readiness of the men to adopt native methods and to use the assistance of natives in their work. For instance, they wear native clothing, employ native equipment and often eat native food when travelling. Because of this wise policy, they have been able to conquer the Arctic, whereas many of the old explorers failed.

As will be readily understood, their hardships and difficulties are many. The summers, though short, are pleasant but the winters, as you well know, are long and severe. When on patrol, they have often to travel over vast ridges of broken ice which may cover an area of hundreds of miles. This is especially true among the islands, because the men in that area are compelled to do their winter patrolling over the sea ice, as the islands themselves are frequently too rocky and precipitous to permit of sled travel. Often a patrol is brought face to face with starvation and is compelled to kill and eat its dogs or to drive them on for days at a time without food. Such a state of affairs arises when the patrol is depending for food on the game it encounters en route, as it frequently happens that the expected game is not sighted. Terrible blizzards and intense cold are also common. Then there is the Arctic darkness, which does not last for six months, except at the pole, but may last for several months at the more northerly detachments. Finally, there is the loneliness, which you can easily picture for yourselves when you recall that many of the detachments remain alone for a year without more than a handful of natives for company. In some instances, men have been forced to spend the year with only one companion, a state of things which speaks for itself.

Naturally, these hardships are relieved to some extent by the interest of the work, by games, a library and sometimes a radio. But even these are not always sufficient to make life endurable. In such cases, anything different is a relief and all kinds of diversions are invented in order to pass the time. A chum of mine, named Charlie told me that when he had exhausted every other resource, he organized the seals and walruses into parliaments. I don't really believe that; but I do believe, because I have seen photographs to prove it, another somewhat similar story of his. There are no horses in the Far North but there are plenty of musk-oxen, so Charlie captured a musk-ox, saddled it, broke it and rode it, then reported to the Commissioner that he had carried out the annual riding course required of all members of the Force. I don't know what the Commissioner thought about this. He may have been annoyed. He certainly must have wondered how Charlie managed to carry out the instructions referred to, in an entirely horseless country. And here's another interesting fact. The Canadian Post Office frequently delivers the letters addressed to Santa Claus to the Far Northern detachments—after all, that is the proper thing to do. And the men help to pass the long winter nights by answering these letters. In this way, we may fairly say they earn their Christmas dinner.

Now, before making the North-West Passage, we'll take a quick run up to the more northerly detachments. In this run, the first detachment we come to is Pangnirtung, near the southern end of Baffin Island. When our expedition visited it in 1925, the N. C. O. in charge was Sergeant Wight, a great, big, good-natured, quiet chap, with next to nothing to say about himself, and altogether unlike the Mounted Police Sergeant we come across in cheap fiction. Yet, with Inspector Wilcox, Inspector Joy, Staff-Sergeant Dempster and a few others, he is without a doubt one of the outstanding polar travellers of today. You don't see him often mentioned in the newspapers but it is a fact. In the very short patrol season of 1924-25 Sergeant Wight, with three others of the detachment, patrolled 5,190 miles, partly by boat but mostly with dogs, a distance more than one and one half times the distance across the North American continent along the Canada-United States boundary, much of it through little known country.

Next we come to Pond's Inlet, on the north end of Baffin Island, chiefly celebrated for its connection with the Janes murder case. In April, 1920, a trader named Janes was murdered by the Eskimos at Cape Crawford four hundred miles within the Arctic Circle. The natives had never heard of the white man's law, because the Mounted Police had never been in that particular area, but it was felt that the crime could not be allowed to pass unnoticed. So the Government decided to take action. They did not send a regiment or even a patrol, as might have been expected. They sent only one man, Staff-Sergeant Joy, recently promoted to Inspector, I am glad to say, in recognition of his fine work in the north. But Joy embodied in himself the powers of the entire Government and so was as good as a regiment for the job in hand. He landed at Ponds Inlet in July, 1921, and spent the following winter ranging far and wide over Baffin Island pursuing his inquiries. At all times, he carried his life in his hands. The Eskimos are normally a good-natured, docile people, but liable to become violent suddenly through suspicion, anger or fear—incidentally, most of the murders which have taken place in the Arctic have been due to these unexpected outbursts. It was quite on the cards that the people of Cape Crawford might easily have associated Joy's presence with the death of Janes and might therefore have decided that for their own well-being it would be best to dispose of Joy also. However, Joy handled the situation so tactfully that they never suspected anything; in fact, they became very friendly. In spite of all obstacles, Joy eventually found the body of the murdered man, conducted an autopsy, held an inquest as coroner, then discovered the identity of the murderers, arrested them in his capacity as constable and as Justice of the Peace held the preliminary inquiry and committed them for trial. The chief criminal was a native named Nookudlah and an interesting sidelight on the Eskimo character is provided by the fact that this man worked as a dog-driver for Joy for several months before his association with the murder was discovered, without apparently realizing that he was in any danger. This gives one a good idea of the simplicity of these natives. At the same time, it does not in the least alter the point that Staff-Sergeant Joy was in a hazardous position during his investigations because of the possibility that his purpose might be detected and resisted.

In 1923 a court was assembled at Ponds Inlet to deal with these three natives. The trial then held constituted, I believe, the most northerly trial ever held in the world. Nookudlah was sentenced to ten years in the penitentiary and one of his accomplices received the sentence of two years with hard labour at Ponds Inlet. The sentences were comparatively light because it was found that there had been some provocation and because Janes had been killed in accordance with Eskimo law, that is, a general meeting of the community had decided that it was best to make away with him and had appointed Nookudlah executioner. The Judge complimented Joy on his excellent work. Nookudlah was brought down to the south, being taken to Stony Mountain Penitentiary, but unfortunately, as the Eskimos, through living in the pure air of the Arctic, are not immune to the diseases we have down here, he caught tuberculosis. As it would never do to have him die in the south, lest the natives might think that he had been killed by us after word had been given that he was to suffer nothing more than imprisonment, the Government thereupon decided to return him to his own people and we took him back with us to Ponds Inlet in 1925. It was very interesting to note that he bore no ill-will towards Staff-Sergeant Joy, in fact, they were the best of friends and used to spend hours talking about seals and komatiks and blubber. Poor Nookudlah wanted nothing more than to get his teeth into a nice fat seal-steak again. I am sorry to say that he has since died.

Just across the Sound from Ponds Inlet is the next detachment, Dundas Harbour, on North Devon Island. When we visited it in 1925, we found only three people living on it and those were the men of the detachment, who had lived there alone for a whole year. It had not been intended to leave them in such isolation but the natives who should have been with them and who had arranged to join them by crossing the ice from another island during the winter, had been unable to reach them. Before the year was up, owing to lack of this native assistance, they were in some respects in desperate straits. For instance, they had to make fur-caps and mitts for themselves from the skins of husky pups, as they were unable to get about the country sufficiently to kill enough game. But they seemed little the worse for their experience and quite cheerful, so much so that they were willing to spend a second year at the detachment. We left some natives with them but when the ship returned in the following year, instead of three white men she found only two. One of the Policemen had died during the year and the remaining pair had been through the ordeal of spending several months on the island with their dead comrade. That is part of the price which has to be paid for the maintenance of Canada's dominion in the Arctic.

The next detachment touched at on the way north is Craig Harbour on the south side of Ellesmere Island. In 1925 it was the base for what was then the world's most northerly police patrol. This patrol was made by Corporal T. R. Michelson. He had been an aviator during the war and his record in the Royal Air Force, according to himself, seems to have consisted of one crash after another, in which he escaped more by good luck than good management. So it is not surprising that he came through all the perils of the patrol without injury. Two attempts to make this patrol were necessary. With his objective Kane Basin Detachment, on the east coast of Ellesmere, which at that time consisted simply of a depot, he made two attempts to accomplish his mission. On the first attempt, conditions compelled him to turn back after a few days' travel. The second attempt was successful. Accompanied for half the distance by three Eskimos who had come over from Greenland to visit Craig Harbour and by a native named Klishook, employed at the detachment, but making the return journey with Klishook only, Michelson travelled over the sea ice of Smith Sound. This neighbourhood is full of tragic associations, as in 1883-84 those very waters had furnished an impassable barrier in the path of the Greely Exhibition of the United States, which had been thus prevented from reaching Greenland and hence had been marooned all winter on Ellesmere Island till, out of a total strength of 26, only 6 were left. Blizzards which forbade all travel, smashed sledges and bitter cold were features of the northward run. While crossing a glacier one of the dogs fell down a seventy-five foot crevasse and was rescued by the party at the risk of their lives. When they arrived at Kane Basin, their first need was for matches. You can imagine Michelson's surprise and disappointment in discovering that a large box marked "Matches" which he hastily broke open contained, not what he sought, but—ladies' underwear ! I might explain that this underwear had been sent north for issue to destitute Eskimo women.

On the return journey, the conditions already encountered were repeated, and, towards the end, the patrol was placed in a position of very great danger when Michelson lost all but three of his dogs in a bear hunt. Sighting two polar bears towards dusk one day and being badly in need of meat, he gave chase and, when the dogs winded the bears, loosed them by cutting all the traces with his knife, in the Eskimo way. The dogs disappeared in the twilight and that was the last Michelson ever saw of them. Nor did he ever see any sign of the bears—an Arctic mystery. Next morning, two of the missing animals turned up and a fortnight later the third somehow found its way back to Craig Harbour. But the rest of the team never came back.

As a result, the patrol was severely handicapped at a very critical time. They could not afford to abandon any of their equipment, yet, being short of supplies, had to keep moving. The problem was solved by dividing Klishook's team between the two sledges. Thanks to this loyal co-operation, they were able to make slow but sure progress. Their troubles, however, were not yet over. Some time later they got separated in a dense mist and did not see each other again till they reached Craig Harbour. Each man feared that the other had been drowned, as the rest of the way lay over broken ice in which a slip meant certain death. You can easily imagine their joyful reunion, when they at last reached home. The time occupied in making this patrol totalled twenty-five days and the distance covered 485 miles. During the entire journey they never met a soul.

Kane Basin detachment, to which Michelson travelled, formed the limit of our northward voyage in 1925. We were supposed to establish a detachment at Bache Peninsula, some fourteen miles to the north, but were prevented from doing so by ice conditions. We could only gaze on it from afar; but in 1926, after three unsuccessful attempts which typify the determination and perseverance of the Mounted Police, the detachment was established, with Staff-Sergeant Joy in charge. The other day I asked Joy what he thought of the place and he informed me that it was the best detachment in the north, in fact, a paradise. Whether you would agree with this depends on the interpretation you put upon the word "Paradise." Of course, if you like solitude and an open-air life and the opportunity of studying nature, especially of studying wild life in vast multitudes, then you would consider it a "Paradise."

It was from Bache Peninsula that Joy made a patrol that in some respects is the greatest of all northern patrols. Crossing Ellesmere he made a complete circuit of the northern group of islands, covering 1,320 miles in 54 days. He had only two natives with him and during the entire journey they met no human being, while they had a series of hair-raising adventures. Had this patrol been made by a recognized explorer, it would have received reams of newspaper publicity. I do not say this in any attempt to disparage the work of such men, as many of them have been generous in their acknowledgments of what the Mounted Police have done. For instance, one of the greatest of them all recently expressed to me the opinion that the Mounted Police were in the first rank of polar travellers. This is the opinion of Captain "Teddy" Evans, who was second in command to Captain Scott. At present, it is impossible for the general public to realize the full value to Canada of such journeys as this. Only as time passes will this be made apparent.

Having now touched at all the more northerly detachments, we will rapidly return south to make the North-West Passage. As I said before, it is impossible in the limited time at our disposal to touch at more than two or three of the detachments in this area. One of the first met with on the way west is Port Burwell, in Hudson Strait. There is a lighter side to life at Port Burwell, as you can see from this photograph [picture shown] of the Mounted Police Canadianizing the Eskimos, through a banquet held on Empire Day. But in November, 1920, when Sergeant Wight was in charge there, it witnessed one of many similar scenes which serve to emphasize the perils of police work in the Far North. A patrol was sent by motor boat to Cape Chidley. On the way back they ran into a gale, which flooded the engine so that they had to anchor the boat. It was decided that Corporal Butler, in charge, and a civilian named Lyall, had better land and walk to the neighbourhood of the detachment, there to get help. Soon after they left the boat, a blizzard came on and eventually conditions became so bad that Butler decided to take refuge in a snowbank. Lyall insisted on pushing on. During the night, Sergeant Wight became anxious and sent out a search party as soon as the storm dropped sufficiently to make it safe to do so. The party rescued Corporal Butler, who escaped comparatively lightly.

His feet were frozen solid to the ankles, but he completely recovered. Through a continual blizzard raging during the next week, the party continued to search for Lyall. They found him eventually, frozen to death on a rock on which he had sat down to rest. That's just another example of the price of empire in the Arctic.

The next point at which we stop is Fort Churchill, on the western side of Hudson Bay. At present, Fort Churchill is appearing prominently in the newspapers as the future terminus of the Hudson Bay Railway. In winter, it does not look a very prepossessing spot at which to detrain, though of course it is quite nice in summer. Hitherto, however, its chief claim to distinction has lain in the fact that it has been the starting point for several great Mounted Police patrols.

Among these patrols, the principal is known as the Bathurst Inlet patrol and is interesting because it was the longest ever made in the Arctic. Some years ago, two white men were murdered on Bathurst Inlet, on the shores of the Arctic Ocean. Word of the crime did not reach the Mounted Police until nearly a year later, and it was not found possible to send out a party until July, 1914, when Inspector Beyts proceeded to Churchill from Halifax. During the following summer a base was established on Baker Lake, and, when winter came, the Inspector made two attempts to reach Bathurst Inlet, but could not do so owing to the almost total absence of deer on which the patrol was to depend for food.

In 1916 Inspector French came out to carry on the work and in March, 1917, he finally got started. He was accompanied by Sergeant-Major Caulkin and four natives with lovely names, Quashak, Bye-and-bye, Joe, and an Eskimo lady named Soloman. They had three dog teams with sleds and two canoes. It took them two months to reach Bathurst Inlet, whence they proceeded to Bernard Harbour. They endured severe hardships, as they suffered a great deal from cold and exposure, their clothing wore out until they were practically in rags, they were badly frost-bitten and snow-blind half the time, while the white men suffered greatly in health from the straight meat diet on which they were compelled to live. On reaching Bernard Harbour, they were seriously short of supplies. Inspector French described this stage of the trip as the hardest he had ever made. Having completed its investigations, the party re-outfitted at Bernard Harbour, where there was a Hudson's Bay Company post. The return journey to Baker Lake, which they reached on January 29th, occupied three months. Before it was over, they were on the verge of starvation and under the necessity of killing many of their dogs to keep the rest alive. In fact, the situation at one time looked so gloomy that the Inspector wrote in his diary that "it looked like their last patrol." However, they finally reached their base in safety, having satisfactorily accomplished their mission. They found that the murders had been committed under extreme provocation and therefore did not bring back the murderers to trial, but they impressed the white man's law on all the natives met with so thoroughly that the patrol is still remembered in that country. Altogether, the party travelled 4,500 miles and were absent ten months, while the entire expedition occupied three and a half years.

Now, passing rapidly by Bernard Harbour and other detachments, we come to Herschel Island. This point is associated with one of the most exciting of all Mounted Police Arctic adventures. I may say, incidentally, that I made use of this episode in a very much modified form in a recent book, and was criticized by a newspaperman, who said that it was impossible. Inspector Phillips, one of the principals in the affair referred to, I frequently see in Montreal, and I have read his report and heard the story from his own lips, so can assure you that it is true.

In 1918, Inspector Phillips, with Constables Cornelius and Doak, was wrecked eight miles from Herschel Island when his whaleboat was crushed to pieces in the ice. They had to abandon the wreck and jump from icepan to icepan. The cakes constantly overturned and then it was a case of jumping for their lives. Finally, they reached the more or less solid ice along the shore, and from it got to the nearest land. To reach the land they had to cross over a score of leads or open lanes in the ice by swimming. It is easy to imagine the strain and physical effort involved in swimming over twenty leads in the freezing Arctic sea. It took the party ten hours to get to shore. Then they started to walk to Herschel Island. A strong gale was blowing and in their wet clothing they suffered intensely, especially as they had been compelled to throw away their heavy outer clothing in order to swim at all.

Doak became delirious under the strain and, as the Inspector and Cornelius could not carry him, it was decided that Cornelius should go on to Herschel for help while the Inspector remained behind to look after Doak. The Inspector built a shelter of driftwood and there the two men remained until rescued by a whaleboat at 11 p.m. next day. A sharp lookout was kept for Cornelius, but he was not seen en route nor was he found at the post. The Inspector thereupon sent another boat to look for him. He was found marooned ten miles away and brought in. It is pleasant to be able to add that none of the party suffered any permanent ill-effects, as a result of this adventure.

At this point I want to mention a very interesting and mysterious fact. Some years later Doak was treacherously murdered in the north on the same day and almost at the same time as Cornelius died in hospital at Edmonton. So these two men, who had been comrades in life, were also comrades in death.

Our journey has taken us all but completely through the North-West Passage. About four hundred miles away from Herschel is Dawson, capital of the Yukon. Hundreds of stories showing how law and order were maintained there by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police during the Gold Rush and afterwards could be told of Dawson, but I propose to speak of only one Yukon incident, selecting this because it gives a glimpse of the brilliant detective work which has built up the reputation of the Mounted Police and led to the association of the name of the Force with the cheap phrase, "Get your man!"

On Christmas Day, 1899, four men left Fossal's roadhouse on the Yukon River bound for the outside. Their names were O'Brien, Olson, Clayson and Relphe. The Mounted Police, who kept track of the comings and goings of all men in that country, noted their departure. And when time passed and the men were not seen at the next point along the river, they noted that too. And word was sent to all detachments to keep a sharp lookout for the quartette, while patrols also examined the trails.

So in due course the detachment at Tagish saw a strange man alone on the river near the post, with a horse and sleigh. This man made a detour especially to avoid the detachment, a suspicious action, as a man does not avoid the Mounted Police in those wild places unless there is something against him. The detachment, therefore, went out and arrested him—just in time, as it happened, because he had landed himself and his outfit in a dangerous hole and he was drowning when the police pulled him out. The man was O'Brien. When questioned about the whereabouts of Olson, Clayson and Relphe, with whom he had left Fossal's, he would not answer. He was searched and on him were found a curious nugget shaped like a hand, and a strange coin, while his sleigh was packed with banknotes. The Police made inquiries and found that there were witnesses who knew that the nugget and coin had belonged to Relphe, while the banknotes were Clayson's. It began to look as if Mr. O'Brien had set his heart on getting Clayson's money, had killed him with that purpose in mind, and had polished off the others at the same time, so that there would be none to bear witness against him.

It now became the job of the Mounted Police to find out, firstly, if the three men really had been murdered and, secondly, if they had been murdered by O'Brien.

Constable Pennecuick was called in. From time to time others assisted him, but the full credit of the investigation belongs to him. Examining the bank of the river along which the party had travelled on their way to the outside, he soon noted, even under a recent fall of snow which tended to screen it, a point up which someone had climbed. Going up the bank, he was surprised to find that he had a clear view for miles along the river. The trees at that point, he discovered, had been recently cut down. Soon it struck him that this had been done so that a lookout might be kept for persons coming along the river trail. Next he examined the tree-stumps and found that the axe used to cut the trees down had been peculiarly dented, leaving marks which proved this upon the chips and stumps. He kept some of the chips. Now he searched for a trail down to the river, found traces of it, got a broom and carefully swept aside the screening snow. And so he gradually uncovered a track which showed that a heavy body or bodies had been dragged down to the river and dropped through a hole in the ice, to get rid of them. Pennecuick continued his work with that broom of his and soon found several bullets, including one in the earth from a .45 rifle.

At this point Providence stepped in, if ever Providence has stepped in anywhere to bring a murderer to justice. A dog came out of the bushes. It was a dog which belonged to O'Brien and which Pennecuick knew well, for he had seen it when O'Brien was in jail at Dawson for some minor offence some months before. Pennecuick thought 'This dog wants to say something. I'll tell him to go home and see what he'll do.' So he told the dog, 'Go home, sir, go home!" And the dog, obeying led him to a tent hidden deep in the woods. There, in the tent, were the .45 rifle and the remains of a fire in which clothing had been burned. Pennecuick found buttons in the ashes, marked with the name of a Seattle firm—Clayson had come from Seattle to the Yukon. In the stove he found other relics. Then, putting himself in the murderer's place, he thought, "Before O'Brien burnt these clothes, he would search them and throw away anything he did not want. Now, where would he throw it to?" To make sure, he went and stood by the stove, as O'Brien must have done, and threw a handful of small objects carelessly away, again just as O'Brien must have done, noting where these fell. Then he got his broom and carefully swept away the snow near each object. His perseverance was rewarded by the discovery of a safe key and another strange coin.

The trial was held. The evidence was conclusive. A witness was found to tell of how O'Brien had suggested to him a plan of preparing a camp such as Pennecuick had discovered, to which victims could be lured and in which the murderer, watching for enemies, could lie in concealment afterwards. O'Brien's axe was produced and found to be nicked just as the axe used for clearing the lookout near the camp had been nicked, according to the evidence of the chips Pennecuick also exhibited. The safe key was found to fit Clayson's safe in Seattle, the coin belonged to Relphe. The strange nugget and the first coin were produced. Even the dog was produced. To clinch the matter, the river at this time gave up its dead and Pennecuick was able to prove by other clues discovered that these men had been killed at O'Brien's camp. And altogether a net of circumstantial evidence through which no being on earth could have wriggled was woven around the murderer. The judge congratulated Pennecuick whom he called a genius. The jury found O'Brien guilty in half-an-hour. So in spite of all his precautions he was hanged and he died cursing the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

The O'Brien case has carried us past the detachment at Fort McPherson, to which we must retrace our steps, because Fort McPherson is immortalized by its association with the supreme epic of Mounted Police work in the Far North, the Fitzgerald patrol. I could not close with a greater story than this. It is in all respects perfect, as perfect as though it had been planned by a master poet. The names of the four men of the patrol, Inspector F. J. Fitzgerald, Constables Kinney, Taylor, and Special Constable Carter, should be held in reverence in every home in Canada. With them stands Corporal Dempster, who was Fitzgerald's great rival and who is still carrying on in the north in defiance of time and hardships.

A few days before Christmas, 1910, Fitzgerald and his party left Fort McPherson to make the annual patrol to Dawson, about 400 miles away. They carried dispatches and the mail. The mail was a specially precious burden, of course, to be carefully guarded and transported at a high rate of speed. In order to make a quick trip, the patrol travelled with only just the amount of food required to carry them and their three dog-teams to Dawson. Only Carter had ever been over the trail from McPherson to Dawson, though Fitzgerald had once covered it in the opposite direction, so they were dependent upon Carter for guidance.

The weather was intensely cold, with trails made desperately hard by the bursting of the rivers through the broken ice; but they made good progress with the assistance of an Indian named Esau, who took them to a point from which Carter was sure he knew the way.

In the meantime the patrol was expected at Dawson. When it was long overdue, an Indian reported to the officer commanding there that he had left Fitzgerald many days before. Corporal Dempster was accordingly sent out in command of a rescue party. He made a record run to McPherson and when within 35 miles of the Fort, discovered why the Fitzgerald patrol had not turned up. Here he found the bodies of Kinney and Taylor, who had died from starvation and exposure.

Fifteen miles farther on, only twenty miles from safety he found the bodies of Fitzgerald and Carter, also dead from similar causes. From the Inspector's diary, Dempster learned the whole story.

Soon after parting with Esau, Carter found that he did not remember the way to Dawson. For days, urged on by their desire to do their job, at all costs, the patrol had searched for the route without success and had been finally compelled to turn back in a desperate effort to retreat to McPherson. Eventually Fitzgerald and Carter had given the two weaker men all the food and all the bedding and struggled on in a final effort to get assistance. I will pass over the pathetic details of the Inspector's ministering to his comrades and of his will, and quote only a sentence from one of Dempster's reports, a sentence which takes on tremendous significance, because of the way in which it summarizes the whole great tragedy as though it referred merely to the work of a mail-carrier on a city street:

"The regular Herschel Island-Fort McPherson mail for Dawson, carried by the Fitzgerald patrol, was found secure and intact under Inspector Fitzgerald's body; and the same has been duly delivered."

There is no need to comment upon this. So long as we carry on in this spirit, our country has nothing to fear.

INTERNATIONAL TRADING IN GRAIN

AN ADDRESS BY ROBERT MAGILL, M.A., PH.D.

2nd February, 1928

The speaker was introduced by PRESIDENT FENNELL and was greeted with applause. He spoke as follows: I suppose your only interest in wheat is the importance of the wheat in our financial structure. Not many of you are actively concerned in the marketing of grain. Consequently I will say a few things about the grain situation just as it is, particularly in reference to our last crop. Our last crop in the three prairie provinces will turn out to be over four hundred million bushels, one of the largest crops in the history of Canada. On the other hand, our crop as it is running, is very short in quality, far below the average crop to which we have been accustomed in the past. On the first of February the total number of cars of wheat that came down to the head of the lake was something over a thousand. Out of that total there were only four cars of No. 1 Northern, that is the top grade. A very few cars of No. 2 Northern, but there were about 780 cars of no grade wheat in that day's inspection. What does that mean? No grade wheat means wheat with too much water. That tells a story of this year's crop. We had bad weather at the seeding time, we had bad weather at the harvest time, we had frost in July, we had a heavy attack of rust all over Saskatchewan and Manitoba; and the result is that on the average this year our wheat crop will not go higher than say No. 4. No. 1 Northern sold yesterday at $1.41½, or thereabouts, No. 4 sold only at $1.10½. There is that difference between No. 1 and No. 4. So that we shall realize on this crop nothing like the profits that we had hoped to realize. It is not much better, than No. 4 on the whole. Now the reason of this is the weather conditions, which are hard to fight, and adequate protection against rust is still in the future. These are the great difficulties that we labor under in the western provinces, and the result is the low quality of our enormous grain crop. That makes the crop this year pretty difficult to sell. On the average, year in and year out, our western crop has been of such a quality that the English and the Germans were glad to get it, because they could mix it with grains from other countries that were not so strong as ours, but the low quality of our crop this year does not make it especially valuable for mixing with other grains. Now, the tendency of the English miller and the German miller, is to look to the Argentine Republic for the kind of wheat he used to get in Canada. If he secures good hard dry wheat in any of these countries we shall find it still more difficult to sell our present wheat crop at good prices.

It is not the easiest thing in the world to sell wheat from Canada. Whatever may be the popular opinion, it is a rather difficult thing to sell Canadian wheat in the markets of the world. We have so much wheat produced all over the world, and every country that has a surplus exports its wheat to Great Britain and Western Europe. Chinese wheat does not come out very much, except in the form of an inferior flour, but China produces more wheat than we do by a long way. And that cheap wheat is a favorite food in China, and where they do not use that they use cheaper foods, such as millet and rice; —which they prefer to Canadian wheat. With all our talk about our Oriental markets, the Oriental markets for Canadian wheat are still small. In average years the Oriental market may absorb a total of forty million bushels, being a part from Australia, a part from the American Pacific slope, and part from us. The ordinary Chinaman is not overburdened with cash. He cannot buy our high quality flour; he does not pretend to. The result is that the market for our western wheat or flour in the Orient is a limited market. Our market in Europe, again, is limited. It may surprise some of you to know that a favorite bread for many Europeans, perhaps a majority of Europeans, is rye bread. When rye is plentiful and is cheap, we cannot sell our flour or our wheat in continental Europe at high prices; and when you take other competing foods, you will realize that there is a limit to the price those people will pay for our wheat. Put it above that limit and they won't buy it at all; they will live without it. That limit is there, fixed as the Rockies, something we cannot overcome, something arising directly out of the financial conditions of the people; reinforced, of course, in the Orient, by age-long custom and habit, and reinforced in Europe by the stringent conditions of finance that are the aftermath of the war there.

Have you considered what that aftermath is like? Britain, which a few years ago was the richest country in the world in international trading, is today one of the poorest countries of the world in the matter of international trade. The British still need cotton and wheat and meat and oil and a hundred and one things which she must import if she is to survive. How is she to pay for those things? Gold? She hasn't gold enough left to buy any one of them,—the amount that she needs in one year. She cannot pay in gold. We do not want her paper money. Securities? Well, she has some securities left; she destroyed the securities accumulated by three centuries of wonderful commerce, but to pledge the balance of her securities would mean the end of her industrial career. The one way a great nation pays another is by goods or services. There is no other way. But on the North American continent we are not anxious, not particularly anxious, to take her goods, or her services either. We have a tariff wall, to which I do not object, —I am only speaking of the conditions—and I repeat that the enormous national debt over there, terrific taxation, the exhaustion of securities, make it very difficult for Britain to buy in the international markets, the raw materials and food supplies she requires. We have so much wheat to sell; we try to sell that in England first, then in Germany, then in Italy and France and so on. These nations are our best consumers, but are from an international point of view in poverty.

We have also conditions arising from the nature of our business, that an open market is always liable to. The Winnipeg Grain Exchange, is international in its organization. It is not restricted to Canadians. We admit men of all nationalities. Great English importing firms have offices in our Grain Exchange. In Winnipeg they are exporters of our wheat. In England they are importers trying to buy at the lowest possible price. It makes rather a difficult competition. The same is true of other countries. The greatest of the French importers has offices in our building and sends men there. In France he is an importer, one of the greatest in the world. In Winnipeg he is an exporter, and that wonderful firm uses all its brains and all its energies and whatever capital it has to secure wheat cheaply. It means strenuous competition. We have thirty or forty or fifty firms of the United States, members in our market, with their representatives and their offices there, all engaged in the work of shipping, forwarding and exporting grain. We have that keen competition, and the competition and conditions of the European market, which I have outlined. So as I say, the export of wheat is not a game for lazy men, it is not a game for stupid men, and the importers among the exporters of wheat are a very considerable proportion. There is no more difficult business than that of exporting wheat from Canada to the markets of the world.

But perhaps you may think we ought to get all our Canadian wheat into the control of one company, feed the market, and control the flow of wheat to Europe, so that the supply offered never will exceed the demand, or a point below the demand, then your difficulties would disappear and the price go higher. Very well. Let us suppose all our wheat in the west was in the hands of one great corporation, a government body, a grain exchange firm, or a pool. Would it then be possible to keep the supply offered always a little below the demand, and keep the price up? We have to sell our crop before the new crop appears; we cannot afford to hold it. That is the first point. The second point is that we have geography. It is cheaper for us to get our wheat across the lakes, from the point of view of transportation than to hold it over for the all-rail freight rate. But beyond such points as these there is this: If we hold back our wheat certain months, if we try to spread it out, what will the other fellow do who has good wheat to sell and to export? What will the United States do? Her wheat appears on the British and other markets just before ours appears. Australian and Argentine wheat comes on the market this time of year. If we hold our wheat back what will those countries do? If we hold our wheat back they will jump in and sell while the selling is good. And so on; I will not enlarge upon it; you can see my point immediately; I think it is clear enough; it cannot be denied. All these wheat-exporting countries compel us to sell our wheat when our buyers want it and if we hold back and they sell, we shall be left at the end of the grain year carrying the bag, and be left possibly with a load of wheat that we can ill afford to carry into a new crop year.

All such schemes as holding back the supply are on paper only. Our pool in this country, very eager, very sincere in their faith, most of them, eager and willing to put up the price for the Canadian farmer, especially eager to close the grain exchange and put the grain trade out of business, after three or four years' actual experience, do not hold back the wheat. They sell when they think they can sell at a good price. It is the wisest thing, the best thing they could do, the necessary thing to do. They have a very large quantity of wheat to sell, and they are selling it, I imagine, when they think the price best suits them. The theory on which the pool is founded is simplicity itself. The fundamental thing about their way of handling grain is that if they can control the supply they can put up the price. If they can feed the market, the market value is bound to go up. But what happens? Well, in the first instance it is very hard to get control of the whole Canadian supply. After several years, the pool handled, including the coarse grains, about 216 million bushels, and the trade handled 277, that is, wheat and the coarse grains. In wheat alone the pool handled 53% last year of the wheat crop. Well, suppose they go up to 55% or thereabouts this year, how can they control the supply of wheat to England? How can they control it so that they can put up the price?—with the wheat from all other countries, with the wheat in Canada not handled in that organization? It is a pleasant kind of dream, but the fairly wise men who are running the business of the pool are not prepared to run it merely on a dream. And with regard to an international pool, that is hardly so much a dream as a nightmare. If every country in the world had a pool, if each nation had a national pool, if each national pool in each nation controlled 100% of the wheat crop, and if they all got together to see what they could do, what would be the result? I remember Mr. Shapiro describing it (in a western town) he said: In that case we will open offices in Liverpool, we will tell English buyers how much we will sell them from month to month and what price we will take, and they will have to come to us. We will cut the "liver" out, and leave the "pool." (Laughter.) But imagine those countries, so diverse in their nationalities and geographical position and in their interests, forming one great international pool. It would be impossible. It is more relevant to consider what would happen if the United States formed a national pool. After several years of testing pools in nearly every commodity you can think of, from hogs to wheat, the pool notion has faded in the United States, and you will notice that the representatives of the farmers in Washington are not looking that way for a solution of their troubles. They are looking in a very different direction. The number of States that grow grain is large and their interests are very different. The States have practically given up the notion of a national pool. There is very little talk about it, partly of course, because the difficulties of organizing it all over the States are so great and also because after ten or twelve years of experimenting with pools in different commodities, the general record of pool organization in the United States has not been a great success, on the whole. There were pools in California that set themselves to improve the quality of the crop, and to assist in the production of their crops. For instance, they took charge of the spraying, and they took charge of what we call the reaping; they took charge of the packing and of the grading and standardizing. Many of those pools in California did magnificent work along those lines, which nobody who knows can object to, and everybody who knows can only commend. Some of them devoted their attention chiefly to selling, however, on the theory that by controlling the supply they could put the price up. That was the pool notion that came into our country. Nothing about production, packing or grading; the emphasis was on selling. The result is that we might as well, in the meantime, forget the possibility of an international pool, and forget the possibility even of national pools in countries like the United States.

We are going on just as before. There are many changes in our industrial and commercial structure. Changes must come. In no department of human experience has evolution stopped. In all it continues, in all it varies, and in every one of them it produces new forms. Evolution has not yet stopped in Canadian commerce or in international trading. It is still going on but while all these changes are taking place, the mountains are still where they were a year ago, or ten years ago, or a hundred years ago. The sun and the moon still keep going on. The fundamental laws of international trade are mighty hard to change. Wrapped up as they are, and implicated with transportation, banking, exchange, and all the rest of it. It is pretty hard to change them artificially by either law or any association. We tamper with them only at our own peril. We should be sure of the new in these matters of international trade before we discard the experience of hundreds of years, in favor of some fad or scheme of our own. We are just going on as we were in the Grain Exchange. This experiment of the pool had to come; our farmers demanded it. It was their right to have it, and they are having it, and they are still members of the Grain Exchange, and members of all our institutions connected with it. They are still trading in futures, and I am sure in a city like Toronto nobody can approve of trading in futures. (Laughter.) And they are selling as we are selling just when they think they can get the best price. And there is no infallibility in the judgment of the men in charge, nothing like it; they do not claim it. There is a limit to what they do claim, after all. If you take the nine good men who are in charge of the selling of the immense amount of wheat they handle, not one of the nine would dream of claiming an infallibility of judgment. The pool of course satisfies the farmers; they are learning more about doing business, they are learning more about the troubles and difficulties. It is perhaps better to have a self-satisfied farmer perhaps than a prosperous farmer. The experiment is being worked out; there are no difficulties being put in the way. Some day we shall know exactly whether there is anything in this scheme that is going to become permanent, whether there is anything more than an interesting and valuable experiment. But in the meantime we are still going on with our work, and I am glad to be able to say to this audience that in spite of the frost and the rain and the rust, and of pools and prohibitionists and of all the crowd of troubles that come, we still are optimistic in Western Canada, we still look forward with unabated confidence to the prosperity of the west, and if it were prosperous, I would venture to say that Toronto will get the most of it. (Applause.)

The thanks of the Club were tendered to the speaker by a visitor from Australia, Mr. J. H. C. Julius, Chairman of the Committee for Scientific and Industrial Research for that Commonwealth.

THOMAS HARDY

AN ADDRESS BY PROFESSOR PELHAM EDGAR, PH.D. ETC.

9th February, 1928.

PROFESSOR EDGAR was introduced by PRESIDENT FENNELL, and spoke as follows: When hardly more than a week removed from the ranks of the living our supreme soldier and our supreme artist, it is fitting that this club should commemorate the event so rich in significance for all those who cherish the high traditions of our race. You who have fought with General Haig know his value; it ill befits a laggard behind the lines to estimate his achievements; nor would I venture to appraise the relative greatness of two men whose activity lay in such widely sundered fields. It may be that our great statesmen and our great soldiers dazzle more than our poets the admiration of the living, but the quieter demurer reputations are secure of a more lasting renown. It may be so, I repeat, but the blind Fury with the abhorred shears waits on them alike, and all that we can confidently predict of the future is that it will cherish longest those reputations which do not rest on mere talent, alone, but on insight which derives its nourishment from human sympathy, from simplicity, and from sincerity. (Applause). That, gentlemen, is why the names of Haig and Hardy will live. (Applause.)

My concern today is with the writer, and with your consent, and for my own satisfaction, I do not propose to pitch my words in too high a key. I am not preaching a funeral sermon, where only values are pronounced and deficiencies ignored. I wish rather to give you an estimate, imperfect as all personal estimates must be, of Hardy's reach of power and of his limitations. And I wish you to note at the outset that my statement of his limitations may have more value that I subscribe to the view of those judges whose opinions I most esteem, who assign to Hardy the unchallenged supremacy among the writers of the last generation. We have had an Age of Shakespeare, and an Age of Milton, an Age of Dryden, and an Age of Pope, an Age of Johnson, an Age of Wordsworth, and an Age of Tennyson. There is no declination of virtue, I affirm, to assert that we have had an Age of Hardy. And his death now leaves us without a recognized leader. Let us now confront some of the facts and problems of his career.

Those of you whose literary memory extends back to the '90s of the last century will remember with what tragic pleasure you read the superb story of Tess, and with what tragic amazement, and yet, I trust, with what profound admiration you read the sombre narrative of Jude the Obscure. That book appeared in 1895, and the antagonistic clamor that it aroused definitely closed Hardy's career as a novelist, and closed, as we all mistakenly believed, his career as a writer. We did not realize then that Hardy felt himself released to pursue the dearest ambition of his life, and to devote himself for what he must have considered the brief remainder of his days to the writing of poetry. We probably did not take very seriously a man who commenced poetry at fifty-five. But when The Wessex Poems appeared in 1898 we were surprised to discover, as we discovered from some of the appended dates, that Hardy had been writing poetry for many years before launching on the less congenial work of fiction. And I repeat, we probably did not take his work too seriously. It seemed to us very unmellifluous, very like a blunt finger strumming on an unfamiliar instrument, uncouth as it appeared to us in form, and no less crude in its cruel frankness. Evidently everything was not for the best in the best of possible worlds, and if God was in His heaven, which was very doubtful, all was evidently not right with the world. It was the time when the all too clever Chesterton coined his phrase of the village atheist blaspheming to the village deity, and,—God help us— we probably believed him. Well, Westminster Abbey holds his ashe now, and Millstock Churchyard his heart, so it would appear that men, at least, have forgiven him.

Hardy's career, as I have said, suffered a check with Jude. And poetry seemed to offer no renewal of power. Our adjusted perspective permits us to realize that these queer poems, written some of them in the mid-tide of the Tennysonian and Swinburnian tradition, and reproduced in all their energy and vigor in the verses of his extreme old age, that these queer poems had a value for the younger generation which must compel recognition in every future history of our literary development. It would be foolish to affirm that the poems are all alike good. There are amazing inequalities in Hardy, but the verses are all genuine and sincere and stimulating to an extraordinary degree, and they rest for the most part on a basis of either actual or imagined experience; they are not fantastic and remote, they come home to the hearts and minds of men. I propose to read two or three of the verses before proceeding to the consideration of his work in the novel.

Here is a grim little piece called "The Subalterns." It is rather a characteristic Hardy poem because he is perpetually imagining colloquies between himself and some representative of the heavenly powers. It is a queer sort of churchyard poem for a man who really does not believe in immortality. (Reads "The Subalterns".) There is nothing very heartening or amusing about that poem.

Here is a poem, and one of the very few in Hardy, where a glimmer and gleam of hope shines through the gloom. It is a poem that has a very wonderfully painted winter landscape. (Reads "The Darkling Thrush".) (Applause.)

This poem is a very brief one, called "Wagtail and Baby." It may seem a trifle ironic, to the point of cynicism; I think it is only intensely humanitarian. One of Hardy's characteristics is his intense sympathy for the animal creation. (Reads "Wagtail and the Baby".) (Applause.)

And the last poem that I shall give you is elegaic in tone. Hardy is imagining his own death and he is telling us the way he would like to be remembered. He does not know when he is going to die, but he assumes different forecasts; sometimes it is in the summer months, and sometimes in the winter. It is very simple and sincere and beautiful. (Reads "Afterwards") (Applause.)

It is obvious that on an occasion like this, appropriate though the occasion might otherwise be, it is impossible to make anything more than the most passing reference to Hardy's "Dynasts" which appeared in 1904 and 1908 and which I take to be his signal performance, and one of the great imaginative works of the last hundred years. It is a stupendous achievement, and I think Hardy's supreme powers were for the first time recognized when people recognized the vastness of that particular achievement.

Now I turn back to a consideration of the novels for the brief remainder of my time, and I desire to make mention only of a few particular novels which I consider outstanding. He began to write fiction about 1870. He submitted a novel to George Meredith who refused it, but saw Hardy and said that he thought very highly of it in a way, but would advise him to do something rather different. Hardy took his advice and wrote rather a poorer book called "Desperate Remedies." It was a complicated sort of book with a foolishly contrived plot. In 1872 he published another book, which is hardly to be called a novel, called "Under the Greenwood Tree." It is very idyllic and pastoral and humorous. The peasants in that book are among Hardy's most successful peasants, and that is saying a very great deal. But what I want to say about this book is that the editor of "The Cornhill" at that time was a man called Greenwood, and he looked at the title of this book with his name in it, "Under the Greenwood Tree." So he took the book home from the shelves of the store to his own house, read it and thought it extremely good and communicated with the author and said "I want you to write a novel for me for the Cornhill." So Hardy wrote a novel which is the first great novel of his career, called "Far from the Madding Crowd." That appeared in 1874 in "The Cornhill". I won't relate the incidents of the story, but one curious fact attaches to it. There was a lawsuit with Pinero on the basis of plagiarism; I do not know whether Hardy brought the suit or Pinero. Pinero's play was called "The Squire" and that and the novel were the same plot and everybody recognized it. The truth of the matter was that one woman had sold each of these authors the same plot. (Laughter.)

Now the novels that I consider to be the supremely successful novels of Hardy's career are "Far from the Madding Crowd," "The Return of the Native," "The Mayor of Casterbridge," "The Woodlanders," and "Jude the Obscure."

"The Return of the Native" I do not propose to discuss; I may in general terms indicate that it is generally held, by competent critics and judges, one of the most perfectly fashioned novels in English. I subscribe to that view, except for the final book, which was wrested from Hardy by the existence of the serial readers, except for the final book the story is exquisitely consistent with itself. It is dramatically contrived with a degree of skill that Hardy has never surpassed, I think not even attained. I will not say that throughout his career his novels are significant for the fineness and firmness of their structure, but it is a model of how a novel should be fashioned, and it is intensely moving and powerful in its intellectual qualities.

"The Mayor of Casterbridge" is a fine but faulty book, dominated by the expressive vigor of the Mayor of Casterbridge. It lacks the passing humors of the earlier stories, and nature is thrust into the background. Therefore it has none of the charm and poetry which relieve the gloom of the typical Hardy book. It exemplifies more clearly than the other novels some of the charges levelled against Hardy, his extreme regard for a highly articulated old-fashioned plot, his plethora of incident, his abuse of the element of chance, and his manipulation of coincidence to effect the disasters which he too often imputes to the blind workings of a heedless First Cause.

"The Woodlanders," I turn to now, briefly, because I wish to quote one or two short passages from it. "The Woodlanders" is a book that is redolent with poetry and natural charm. "The nature background of 'The Woodlanders' is exquisitely conceived and presented on the whole, though not one of the most admirable of Hardy's books, from the standpoint of its general conception and style, one of the most charming and poetic. He has attempted there to represent a woman of some pretensions to refinement, Mrs. Charman, but I do not think Mrs Charman is so well turned out as she ought to be. The triumph of the book is Marta, and I wish to read you two or three closing pages which give us her lament for Winterburne whom she had loved and lost because Winterburne had fallen in love with FitzPeers. Some of the people are returning from a search that is in progress for Dr. FitzPeers, and this brought them by way of the church, and passing the graveyard—Charles Winterburne had died some eight months before—they observe a motionless figure standing by the gate. "I think it was Marta—(reading)—For you was a good man and did good things."

In all the books preceding Tess, Hardy had contrived to show humanity enmeshed in the coil of circumstance, but he had kept his personal exasperation within measurable bounds. In Tess and Jude his wrath boils over, and his fierce marginal notes are a perpetual gloss upon the story. When the black flag hoisted on the staff signals the pitiful defeat of Tess's struggle for happiness, Hardy interjects the sinister suggestion, "justice was done and the President of the Immortals—in Aesculean phrase—had ended his sport with Tess."

In "The Dynasts" he took the view that the immanent will from which the universal life proceeds, operates from no conscious malevolence to the human race. I do not quarrel with Hardy that he has no firm consistency in his cosmic theories, but it is less satisfactory that in Tess, where for the first time his theme concerns itself with the institutions of organized society, he should so confidently refer disaster to the blindness of the malign First Cause. Human explanations would have sufficed for his purpose, but though these are not emphasized, the book throbs with human feeling, and it will survive as a superb example of Hardy's sympathy and power.

Hardy's imperfections are casual and negligible, for like every important writer he must have the defects of his qualities. He is not, I grant you, heartening and cheering, and despite his consistently tragic view of human destiny he was sensitive to simple delights, and these are a sunray in the prevailing gloom. If I may intrude a philosophical explanation for his predominant sombreness of tone, we must find it in his fixed belief that the scheme of creation went wrong with the development of human intelligence. The stars and the winds and the waves and the mountains seem to get on very well and uncomplainingly, and the immanent soul works without impediment through the vegetable and the lower animal kingdoms. Developed consciousness is the resistant medium. His peasants are placid enough and if they may suffer they do not vocally resist their fate. As we rise in the human scale the sense of tragedy deepens, and we may be thankful that in Hardy there are few examples of strongly developed intelligence. Tess had a dawning mind, and she suffers correspondingly, as her peasant mother and sottish father were incapable of doing. It was the conflict of the animal nature, and Jude with his aspiring faculties that wrote his downfall more definitely than the superciliousness of his social superiors. Even in this latest book of Hardy's it is the elemental conditions of life, rather than the merely human social arrangements that are the supreme concern.

The general effect and impression of Hardy is one of massive power and grandeur. There is a gloomy outlook always, but I would like to emphasize what I consider to be the right and proper attitude to take with reference to Hardy. There is nothing in him, absolutely nothing in him which pertains to cynicism. There is here and there irony, the irony of circumstance, yes, because he has rather a feeling that men are playing a losing game. He thinks that the general universal life has been, either malignly or unwisely, blind—he won't make up his mind—but life for him is in a certain sense a sorry thing, but it is a very noble thing, and the miserable plight of many human beings is never in evidence alone. Hardy is persistently insisting on all the noble attributes that humanity has developed. We are perhaps crushed by circumstance, but there is a noble element of resistance, and a fine sense of aspiration, which may be cheated and defeated, but the sense of aspiration is there. There are infinite elements of humanity which ennoble it and dignify it, and Hardy is not unaware of these. He is not unaware of the poetry of life; he is not unaware of the humor of life. I think Hardy of all our novelists since Dickens is infinitely the most humorous, humorous of course particularly when he is dealing with the peasants of his novels. His humor does not extend to the characters above the peasant stage, but I do not think since Shakespeare you will find peasants studied with such extreme success as Hardy's peasants. They are there for a philosophic reason as well, if I had time to develop that idea, because they represent the placid norm of life, before intelligence has inflicted itself.

Of all the writers of the past, Hardy is the most significantly and characteristically English. He has given us a picture of the Wessex country, which is Dorsetshire and Wiltshire and one or two of the adjoining portions, like Oxfordshire on occasion. He has given us a picture of these counties which is intimate in its exact detail, and infinitely poetic and infinitely true, and he has not only given you the impression of contemporary England. His vision of England is a stratified vision. You see layers and layers of time. He has a historic imagination and in The Mayor of Casterbridge you find a historic primitiveness an element of power in the book. If you read his descriptions of Egdon Heath you have a cosmic imagination in his outlook. Egdon Heath represents the vast implacable force of nature, and it is amazing the way the human figures play against that background. He is a poet throughout his fiction, and his poetry itself, rough though it may be, is extraordinarily worth reading. (Applause.)

The thanks of the Club were expressed to the speaker by Mr. Hugh Eayrs.

"HUMOUR"

AN ADDRESS BY MR. SEYMOUR HICKS

16th February, 1928

MR. HICKS, introduced by PRESIDENT FENNELL, spoke as follows: Well, gentlemen, I cannot tell you the honour I think it is to be allowed to come here today, and before I say a few words to you, if you will be good enough to allow me to do so, I want to tell you I am not a practised speaker, and do not pretend to be. I have been inveigled here quite in the dark. I have been going to Rotary Clubs, rare fellows who come in with a cheerio and we tell a story and have a drink and good bye. (Laughter and applause.) Then I suddenly discover that the Empire Club is the great club of Canada (Applause) and I very nearly tried to avoid coming to Toronto because I got so frightened about this very moment that I am in in the minute. Gentlemen, I am told that Mr. Baldwin, and Mr. Amery, and these great speakers have addressed you, so you can imagine what I feel like. I generally speak other men's words; in fact I write them whenever I get the opportunity. (Laughter.) Last night between the acts I went upstairs and got some bits of paper and made some little notes, which I do not think I can read because I am not short sighted, and I left my glasses upstairs. (Laughter.)

Well, I didn't do very much, but after the performance I found on my bed a package and on it was written "Empire Club of Canada" and I went at it at once. I opened it and there was a very nice letter, I won't say from whom, and a book in which were printed the speeches for 1926. (Laughter.) Gentlemen, the clothes that I was sitting in, I am in now; I have not been to bed at all. (Laughter.) I opened a card on which was written "Don't miss Hicks". I don't know who is going to throw the first stone, but it flushed me a bit. But here I am, to try and thank you for your great hospitality and also try and tell you one or two little stories, if you will allow me, and above all if I am capable, of talking imperially as one thinks, and with a great love for Canada because I am a Canadian. My great grandfather was born in Halifax in 1760, and my grandfather was born there too. (Applause.)

I throw myself on your mercy, and perhaps you will allow me to talk of the theatre. (Hear, hear.) That is my job, it is my trade, I do not pretend to be anything at anything else, and not much at that, still it is my job, and I could contradict you perhaps if you did say anything about it. I do not want to talk about the theatre as an art, because that would be boring everybody, but I do wish, if you will allow me, to say that it is quite worth while talking about the theatre in its relation to the life of the Empire. (Applause.)

In the old days we were rogues and vagabonds, we actors, and were looked down upon by society, who were rather doubtful of themselves. (Laughter.) Very often it is the actor who picks up the "h" of the society lady and doesn't say anything about it. Today we may be rogues, but I think by Act of Parliament we are not vagabonds. The stage has an enormous influence on the life of our people at home, and I do think we are missing the whole thing if we do not make it one of the greatest bonds that bind the Empire together. (Hear, hear.) You see, the war has knocked it sideways in England, our theatre, from the point of view that there are no theatres running outside those run by speculators, and the consequence is that all our children at home are learning English from the American films. Well, you know what that means, and it is a most terrible thing to go into Birmingham or Edinburgh and ask a boy for a paper, and he says, "Attaboy." (Laughter.) I think, if I may say so, one of the greatest heritages we have got is our language. (Hear, hear.) It is the thing that is going to keep us together more than anything, and if we are going to speak movie talk, well, it is a very sad business, and it will ultimately mean that in fifty years we shall be speaking Attaboy in Edinburgh, and

Gee Whiz in Toronto. (Laughter.) I think that one of the great things the stage can do, and what the Mother Country ought to do for this great country, is to send over as good actors as we can—we are not very good, but as good as we can—with the best companies we can get, the very best, and play the English classics for the rising young Canadian people. (Applause.) A very kind friend said to me the other day that you have got no Canadian theatre. I would like to say, and I hope you will say it now, that you have got a Canadian theatre. Britain's theatre is your theatre. (Hear, hear.) You may have only a little theatre here beginning your work, but that is nothing, we are you; we are proud to have the same blood that you have got; we have the same language; Shakespeare is yours. We have the British theatre and we ought to keep it quite distinct from the American theatre. (Applause.) That is why I do think that the theatre should carry this message first of all, that of good diction. Here also it may be that you will see the manners of our Court, and all that is dear to you in England, properly set before you, and you will not see the king at Buckingham Palace through the eyes of somebody at Hollywood, because it is all wrong. The theatre has always handed down such information. We should know nothing about the manners and customs of Sheridan's day, and the School for Scandal would be a different book were in not for the stage. I was told only the other day, and it interested me very much, that Sheridan's School for Scandal was never in manuscript; it was lost. The last act was written by him on the stage of Drury Lane Theatre, behind the scene, and when the actors had finished the run no one could find it. They had to send for all the actors to come back and memorize their parts, and if that had not been so The School for Scandal would not be in existence today. It is a rather interesting little fact.

One of the great things we know in England, and I think you might consider it, is the benefit the theatre does to children who go on the stage. Of course you have nothing like we have in the terrible poverty that there is in London around the purlieus of Drury Lane; but for many years I have run children's plays sometimes with two hundred on the stage. There was a great outcry; they say, "Children on the stage ? Isn't it terrible !" The truth was that these children not only were educated by us with schools in the theatre, but they earned a lot of money and they were perfectly wonderful little citizens, and they grew up and many of them are out here now, as I have already had four letters in Toronto. Therefore the theatre does a bit of good in that way. So if ever the chance comes along, do not say to the children, do not go on the stage. I should say under proper supervision let them go on the stage, let them learn manners, and how to speak, and be little Canadian ladies and gentlemen. (Applause.)

I personally feel—and I had a long talk in Montreal about it—that I should like to try my best to send out about six companies a year to Canada with the best actors we can get. At present the British authors' contract is that the Americans take the British plays and at the end of it is a little annex, and they put "and Canada." Then they go through the small formality of never bringing the plays here. They may to Montreal and Toronto, and they may send them with fairly indifferent American companies. But I do say, and I have written and cabled to ask the Authors' Society to take up the matter at once and have it not "and Canada" but let them put it "Canada and America." (Applause.) And then by that means we should have our English authors putting our English products into our great Dominion, to whom none of us can be more grateful, I am sure. I hope the day has gone by when you say "No Englishman need apply;" though I know you are apt to judge the whole nation by the behaviour of one or two rather stupid fellows. Personally I would be most willing to give up two or three months a year of my time if I could be of any use in organizing or putting these companies through the great Dominion. I hope if the time comes you will give us a bit of a show, and say : They are trying to do their best to put British stuff before British people. (Applause.)

It is extraordinary the way the world, or part of it, seems to think the British have got no humour. (Laughter.) I had grave doubts about American humour myself, until they told me a year ago in New York that they had won the war, and then I was certain of it. (Laughter.) Looking backwards, I came to the conclusion that there were two or three standard works like Roget's Thesaurus and works of familiar quotations, there is a book of British classic wit, handed down from the days of Queen Elizabeth, the best wit in the world. It is not the wit perhaps of the supper club, where the waiter drops something, and you say something. They might as well say the Scotch have no humour; that is about the biggest lie that has ever been told.

Thinking this over, I thought of little things I personally had heard in my life, mixing with Gilbert and all those fellows in England, and one thing I remember which I am sure you will think is very quick. I was walking with Gilbert at Harrow, and there was an amateur club there. The leader came up and said, "What do you think of our amateur club ?" He said, "It is not so much a club as a bundle of sticks." (Laughter.)

He said to me, "I hear you have been to a fancy dress ball !" I said, "Yes, I was dressed as a gondolier, and got very drunk." "What a ridiculous thing to do, to go as a gondolier and get drunk ! Why not go in the first instance as a Venetian blind ?" (Laughter.)

I was in the Garrick Club the other day and somebody said, "Do you know that Sibbald is supposed to have said the wittiest thing off the bat that has ever been said ?" I said, "That is rather a large order; what was it ?" It was this : Sibbald was managing the Drury Lane Theatre at that time and the Dukes of Buckingham and Rochester were his patrons, and they were waiting for Sibbald in a garden for supper. Sibbald was very late; when he came in Buckingham said, "You are late." "Yes, your Grace." And Rochester said, "Do you know what we have been discussing about you, Sibbald ? We have been wondering whether you will be hanged or die of the pox." Sibbald said, "That depends on whether I adopt your Lordships' mistresses or your principles." (Laughter.)

Nothing could have been better, I think, than Wilde's remark to his warder—one speaks almost with sorrow that such a great genius came to such an unhappy end. At any rate it shows a marvellous spirit of wit. Standing on the station at Clapham—they were taking him from London to Reading jail—it was pouring with rain and he was soaked through, and he said to his warder, "Could I speak to you a moment ?" The warder said, "What is it ?" He said, "If this is the way Queen Victoria treats her convicts, she does not deserve to have any." (Laughter.)

Brookfield said a very witty thing to George Grossmith, the father of the present very successful actor. He was a good soul, but rather conceited. He came back from America with thirty thousand pounds, and he said, "Look at all your stupid actors; you have to have production, an orchestra, a theatre, and so on; I have made thirty thousand pounds with a piano and a dress suit." Brookfield said, "Yes, but we don't all look so d—— funny in our dress suits." (Laughter.)

The Chairman was kind enough to speak about the war; I did nothing more than anybody else, but we were all turned down time and time again. I remember it suddenly struck me in 1914 that all the fellows who were volunteering would want some amusement, because they had been accustomed to it all their lives. I got an introduction from the late Lord Birmingham and went to see Lord Kitchener. After being pushed about by a lot of young gentlemen—you remember them—being pushed here and there and everywhere, I was shown into Lord Kitchener's room. He said, "What do you want ?" I said, "I want to know if I can take a concert party to France." He said, "What for ?" So I said, "To try to amuse the troops." He said, "When ?" I said, "On Christmas Eve." He said, "Oh, do you think they are going to stop fighting on Christmas Day ?" Well, I am bound to say I lost my temper, and I said, "It has nothing to do with me; I am not a soldier, I am an ordinary Englishman, and I am trying to do a bit of my job." He said, "It is very kind of you." All the tin hats rattled and I was allowed to go. When we came back I thought it would be a very good thing to open theatres for the overseas soldiers. They were walking about in thousands all about the streets with nothing to do and no friends, and they did not know anybody. I went down and asked the Lord Chamberlain if I could open the Princess Theatre for Sunday night, which we did for a couple of years, and we had two thousand in a night. They got the best entertainment it was possible for England to give them, because we were all trying to do the best we could. There was trouble about opening. The Lord Chamberlain said there was some law of Edward VI. or Edward the Confessor that did not allow places of entertainment open. Well, ultimately, we got it, and the result was that the Canteen Boards were started, and I am sure it would be of interest to you to know that the diseases of the troops that were on their beam ends over at Salisbury Plains fell from 60% to 6% and 7%, purely through the fellows working in the theatre. (Applause.) I hope you do not mind my mentioning that, but it is a fact and shows that after all the theatre has its uses.

In conclusion, I will ask you to listen to three or four little stories and let me off. There was a stockbroker in England who asked a Cockney friend down to spend a week in the country, and he got a bit sick of him toward the end of the week. So one day he said, "Jones, I am very busy this morning; go out on to the land. Here is a gun and a couple of dogs. Go out and have a bit of sport." Half an hour afterwards the man came back and said, "Have you got any more dogs ?" (Laughter.)

Of course the Englishman's idea of humour is that the man turns around and says, Did he ? or Was he ?

Another little thing I heard the other day from one of your own people. A girl went to the doctor and said, "I am not feeling very well." He felt her pulse, and said, "Do you suffer from cold feet ?" She said, "Terribly, but not my own." (Laughter.)

I heard a little story that made me laugh, of a child of five in bed with its mother. Waking up towards six in the morning, it said, "Mama, will you tell me a story ?" She said, "Hush, father is coming back in a minute, and he will tell us both one." (Laughter.)

I was once with Richard Harding Davis, the American author, one of the best fellows that ever lived. He told me he had been at a concert of Southern music the night before. They were playing southern melodies, and suddenly a man in front burst out crying. The manager came down and said, "I am sorry you are so affected; I see you are a Southerner." He said, "No, I am a musician." (Laughter.)

I saw something in the paper before I left England that made me laugh. A man rushed hastily into church, when the preacher was in the midst of his sermon. He said to a man sitting near him, "Has he been preaching long ?" He said, "About forty years." "Then I will stay, he must be nearly through." (Laughter.)

A colonel paraded his men and he said, "I want to tell you, and I am glad to tell you, that my wife had a little boy at 3.45 this morning. Officers, non-commissioned officers, and men, I thank you." (Laughter.)

Well, gentlemen, having finished these stories which would bind the Empire together, I finish in thanking you very gratefully for your great kindnesses, and I think what an honour it is to come here. Only one thing I would ask you. If by any chance I can manage to find backing at home, and I think I can, if we can manage to send out companies that will keep your theatres going with English plays for say twelve weeks a year, following each other to the coast and back, that you will think that we are doing it for the Empire's sake, and perhaps you will be kind enough to go in and say, "Well, we will go in and give it a bit of a spin." (Applause.)

The thanks of the Club were extended to the speaker by Sir John Aird.

THE NINETEEN TWENTY-EIGHT BUDGET

AN ADDRESS BY BERNARD K. SANDWELL, F.R.S.C.

23rd February,. 1928

The guest of the day was introduced by PRESIDENT FENNELL, and spoke as follows: I cannot agree with the President that the budget is an interesting subject. It may be an important subject, it may be a subject that affects us more or less in our practical lives, but that it is interesting I cannot admit; even I cannot expect to be able to make it interesting. When I received your invitation an idea occurred to me. I realized that this is, as far as my knowledge goes, the first occasion on which a professional economist had been asked by a Canadian audience to express views about the budget, and that seemed to be an occasion worthy of recognition, so not on my own behalf but on behalf of my fellow economists, I accepted, and I welcome this invitation as one to the whole body of economists as a profession. It is after all reasonable that economists should have ideas on the subject of the budget, but it does not seem to have occurred to anybody before now that they might. (Laughter.)

I have a lot of views about the budget, and they are of a very mixed character. I do not think they have very much of a political character. I am not a politician; I am not regularly attached to any particular party. I have my sympathies, I have my leanings; you may be able to detect them, and it is possible again that you will not. (Laughter.) But I can see good in both parties and I am going to endeavour to indicate to you that I do manage to approve of the budget in some respects, and also to approve of the criticisms that have been hurled at it from some directions.

Unfortunately, budgets in Canada are an excessively political topic. They are almost the only political topic. The budget is almost the only thing that a political party can do in Canada in the way of influencing votes, and after all, influencing votes is the chief business of politicians. (Laughter.)

A budget is a thing that must be done annually ; it is one of those things that a politician cannot avoid doing something about, and therefore it becomes the chief means of practically influencing votes, of attracting votes and repelling votes towards the next election. Now this is not the case in other parts of the British Empire. I look at the British Parliament, and I find that there are a large number of issues upon which the parties do cherish strong feelings and with which you could actually influence votes. It is, of course, much better for the country that governments should do as little as possible than that they should do as much as possible. The electors are wrong. They are always clamouring for the politicians to do things, and in the long run it is much better that the politicians should do as few things and as small things as they possibly can.

I assume that you do not want me to discuss the national balance sheet. You want me, as I take it, to deal with the budget as it effects changes in the fiscal system. These changes are not very numerous or exciting. As far as the tariff is concerned, the chief changes appear to be in the textile schedules, and one or two other smaller matters. Now I hope you will not expect me to discuss the textile schedules at any great length. I am not a textile expert. The changes in the textile schedules have been made after a fairly interesting enquiry into the operations of that industry, conducted by the Advisory Board on Tariff Taxation. And you will permit me to say that I do think it is better that the tariff changes should be made after some such preliminary discussion than that they should be made without any such preliminary discussion at all. It does appear to me to be a good thing that tariff changes should be preceded by a serious examination into the evidence in the case affecting a particular industry, an examination conducted in circumstances which allow a cross-examination of the various parties concerned, which will bring the various parties together so that they can check up on one another's claims, and which therefore make the discussion much more practical, much more effective, than any mere series of claims made by separate and more or less irresponsible people, not taken subject to cross-examination, could possibly be.

The mere discussion among electors, among ordinary electors, among ordinary people, about tariff changes, generally simmers down to an expression of two viewpoints, the viewpoint of the people who think that the tariff cannot possibly be too high, and the viewpoint of the people who think that a tariff cannot possibly be too low. In that discussion the people who think that the tariff cannot be too high have one slight advantage, there is no opprobrious epithet that is applied to them. People who think the tariff cannot possibly be too low, are obviously freetraders, because free trade is presumably the lowest possible tariff as far as protection is concerned, and therefore people who believe the tariff cannot be too low have to shoulder the burden of the epithet "free trader," slightly opprobrious in this country. Both those points of view are of course entirely wrong, and they are purely theoretical points of view. No practical person, no responsible person, no person actively engaged in the business of government, is going to go far on either of those views in practice. The tariff is something that can be too high in a particular item, and it can be too low. And the business of the government is to find out as approximately as possible, about where it ought to be in justice to the consumer and all the other interests concerned. There has been a good deal of discussion already, most of which you have probably read, about the effects of the changes in the textile schedules, which went into operation some four or five days ago. Much of that discussion appears to be slightly premature. It is difficult enough to form an opinion about the effects of the tariff changes that took place one year, two years, three years ago, and it must be slightly more difficult to form an opinion about the effect of those which took place a week ago.

There were some changes in the duties in the automobile industry, I think, two years ago, and they still seem to be under discussion. On my way here I read, in the *Montreal Gazette*, a speech by my friend, T. A. Russell, in which he remarked that the tariff changes made two years ago by the Federal Government had placed serious handicaps in the way of the Canadian automobile manufacturers. At the end of the speech there was given a list of the persons who were present, and from this list I found that many of the eminent Conservatives of the Province of Ontario were on hand to hear Mr. Russell's speech. (Laughter.) It was not a gathering to celebrate the closing up of the automobile industry in Ontario, but to celebrate the opening of a new and enlarged plant—(laughter and applause)—erected by Mr. Russell's industry. So I proceeded to read Mr. Russell's speech more carefully, for I felt sure that he could not have been in quite such a bald contradiction of the circumstances of the case. I found that he went on to say that while the changes had placed serious handicaps in the way of the Canadian automobile manufacturer, his company feels that "to a measure we have succeeded in overcoming those handicaps." A splendid item. If it had not been for those changes, I do not suppose Mr. Russell's company would have known that it could overcome those handicaps. It never would have been provided with the opportunity of patting itself on the back for having overcome them. This morning when I arrived in Toronto I examined your Toronto papers for further light on the same speech, and I found that one of the members of the House of Commons had been informing the company that while it was true that parts of the automobile industry were still flourishing, still they were the wrong parts. (Laughter.) "There can be no doubt," said the member (Mr. Anderson), "that the low tariff legislation of last year injured the early stages of manufacture of our products, and this will be equally harmful, let me say, to the automobile industry. A large number of parts that enter into the automobile truck are manufactured outside of Canada and are admitted free of duty. True, it has helped the secondary stage of manufacture, but it has changed our automobile industry altogether, and today it is becoming to a great extent an assembling industry." This, I said, is very sad, and is probably quite right. I looked back to the *Gazette* of the night before to see what part of the plant Mr. Russell was celebrating in this assembling industry, and I found that Mr. Russell is a little distressed at being called an assembling industry. "Mr. Russell resented the notion that automobile plants in Canada were mere assembling institutions. Although this might have been the case at one time, it was far from true today. The Willys-Overland manufactured the cars as well as the wheels, crank-shafts, clutches and engines, and the plant was in every sense a real manufacturing plant." I am very glad of it. That shows you how difficult it is to arrive at a correct and intelligible estimate of the effect of tariff changes made two years ago, unless one approaches them from the ready-made standpoint that a tariff cannot be too high or cannot be too low; then there is no trouble. I suggest that it is even more difficult, and you will not expect me to discuss with any serious effort at analysis the changes in the tariff which went into effect only a week ago; and the wise thing is to wait a little while and see what effect that will have. After all it will be some months anyway, perhaps a year or two, before we are called upon to express an opinion upon them at the polls.

There is another set of tariff changes about which I do know a little more. There is a change in the paper industry, about which I know a little, which affects the business of the publishers of periodical magazines, manufacturers of periodical publications. May I say here that I have felt for a very long time, and I think I have probably expressed to this Club the feeling that if there is any industry in Canada that is entitled to a certain amount of protection, at any rate enough protection to bring it up to the general level of protection in this country, it is that of the publishers of those periodical magazines and other periodicals which are actually affected by competition from outside. (Applause.) As an industry they may not be very immense in dollars and cents, but I think that their influence is out of all proportion, their importance to the country, their importance to our national interests, is out of all proportion to the mere amount of dollars and cents that they represent. Unlike the automobiles in which we ride, and the foodstuffs which we eat, they do influence the minds of ourselves and of the rising generation that is going to succeed us, and it is important for that reason that they should be placed in the best possible position to compete with the products rival to them which come into this country from outside and which exert no influence toward the development of Canadian national feeling. Now there are two obvious ways in which the periodical industry might have been aided. I believe that their application for aid took an alternative form, or took two successive forms, first an application for tariff protection—and for myself I am unable to see why that could not have been operated—and second, for a reduction of duty on some of the raw materials which go into the manufacture. They obtained a reduction of duty, or a drawback of duty, on one of the raw materials which enter into their manufacture, namely, the paper which is employed in printing. May I point out to you that there are two types of periodicals which will be affected by this drawback on paper. There are the purely literary publications, that is to say, those that are devoted to the publishing of critical literary, imaginative work, fiction, critical writings, essays, and so on, which are directly and constantly subject to an immense competition from the United States, and some slight competition from Great Britain. And there is another type of periodical entirely, the technical trade periodicals, which are not subjected to any competition of the kind. The technical periodical is protected in its field by the very nature of that field itself. It is protected in its field as the local newspaper is in its field. Your newspapers in Toronto do not suffer from the competition of Montreal newspapers. You do not want Montreal newspapers, you want your own Toronto newspapers with your own Toronto news. All you import in the newspaper field are newspaper owners, not newspapers. (Laughter.) The technical papers, the agricultural papers, so far as they are technical, and agricultural, so far as they exist to circulate news, information of the trade of agriculture, or any other trade, are protected naturally in their field in precisely the same way. They do not need any further protection, and it would not do them any harm or any good if there were a tariff on outside American agricultural periodicals, because they are not greatly wanted in this country anyhow. They do not contain the news, the information, that the Canadian agriculturist wants ; and the same is true of all the other technical periodicals. The effect of this drawback in the paper duties, therefore, will be on the one hand to give some slight advantage, not, I think, a very serious one, to those periodicals which are in actual competition, those literary and fiction and essay and critical periodicals which are in actual competition with periodicals from outside, and to give a very decided bonus to the existing technical and agricultural papers which seem to me to be getting on fairly well in Canada even as it is.

May I pass for a moment to the sales tax. The rest of the budget consists chiefly in changes in the various forms of direct taxation. The sales tax is a tax which we instituted some years ago with a great flourish of trumpets, and under the impression that it would be of great value in preventing us from spending money on things we should not, and that it would restore a depleted exchange. Well, it did restore the depleted exchange and the exchange is not now so depleted, and we can afford to do without some of the tax. If there is any tax we can afford to do without, it seems to me it is the sales tax. I regret that the reduction is so small, and also that the budget contains no intimation of any prospective further reduction. It may be that that is being treasured up for us as a gift for next year. I hope so. The tax is certainly a poor one in itself, but it is a nuisance tax that involves a tremendous amount of bookkeeping and labour, the whole cost of which is naturally added in the cost of the article to the consumer.

Then there is the income tax on which I cherish some strong and unorthodox views. They are not unorthodox among economists, but the views of economists have had no weight in this or any other country that I know of. However, it won't do any harm to voice them before you today. The income tax of this country is a good tax in principle, and if consistently applied would be a good tax in practice. It is the one tax which can be effectively graduated in such a way that the man who can well afford to make a larger proportionate contribution to the upkeep of the State can be made to do so. The personal income tax, as it affects direct personal incomes, graduated so as to rise to a higher level upon large and very large incomes, is a tax which is admired and favoured, I believe, by practically all schools of economists, and I have no hesitation in saying that I think it is unanimously favoured by all professional economists in this country, in spite of the fact that it has in the last year or so been subjected to an extraordinarily vigorous and noisy attack by persons without any economic professions. But the income tax as administered in Canada is a great deal more than an income tax. It contains elements which are not an income tax at all, and those elements are elements which the Government has not only not reduced—for I decline to admit that a reduction of one-tenth of one per cent is a serious reduction, it is merely an effort to make methods of calculation easier—these elements are not only not reduced but no suggestion is held out that they are going to be reduced in future, whereas the personal income tax we are told it is the policy of the Government to progressively reduce. The income tax in Canada includes the tax on corporations. Now a corporation has no income. A corporation consists of a body of persons who hold shares in it, or otherwise make it up. They have incomes. They derive part of their incomes from the corporation, if it is lucky enough to make a profit. Their incomes are taxed when they reach them. The corporation is incapable of enjoying anything; it not only has no soul, but it has no body. It has not the capacity for enjoying anything. True income, as you will find in any textbook on economics, is measured by enjoyments, by the satisfactions that the individual receives. Income does occur when the individual receives wealth and puts it to his own use. It does not occur when a corporation receives wealth and puts it to its own uses, until that wealth is distributed to the individual owners. The corporation income tax is a double taxation of a direct kind; it is a penalization of the more efficient corporation in favour of the less efficient corporation, tending to keep alive the less efficient marginal operator in a body of competitors, and to make it more difficult for the more successful, more able operators in that line to get along. And yet we hear no word of protest raised against it. I do not see in the entire debate, so far as it has yet proceeded, any indication that any party in this Dominion proposes to advocate the abolition of this corporation income tax, which, you remember, was originally instituted as a means of tapping the income of the individual recipient at its source, a very reasonable and proper thing to do. It is easier to get income at the source than after it has passed to the hands of the individual. But with the abolition of the exemption arising out of dividends, the exemption of dividends from corporations that pay the corporation income tax, that anticipation of the collection of personal income tax disappears, and the corporation income tax becomes simply a double income tax. More than that, the corporation income tax, as it exists at present is a very potent factor in the misrepresentation of the results of corporation activities in their financial statements. (Applause.) It becomes highly desirable, I might almost say essential, for a corporation if it is making any money at all, to conceal from the Government, and incidentally from everybody else, how much money it is making. So far as the money it is making has to be distributed in dividends, to that extent of course it cannot be concealed, but this policy of taxing corporation earnings, and not exempting dividends, has led to the piling up of concealed reserves, to the making of enormous allowances for depreciation, and other forms of reserve allowances, which any reasonable person can see are extravagant and extortionate, but which allow the company to report its earnings as being apparently visibly much lower than they really are; with the result that many of our corporations are piling up substantial increases in assets, not stating them to the public, not stating them to their own shareholders, and the system intensifies that tendency which is inherent in all corporation organization, that tendency of affording much more information about the real state of the company to those who are engaged in its directing and operation than its shareholders can possibly obtain. It is a system which I as a financial journalist cannot but regard as exceedingly unhealthy, as affording a constant temptation to manipulation, and as unjust to the shareholders of the concerns. In addition to that, this corporation income tax is also a prime factor in the process which is now so very prevalent of repeated re-financing of industrial and other corporations, because unable to distribute the profits that they have made, unable to declare those profits, unable to show them in their balance sheet, storing them up year after year in the form of reserve or depreciation allowances, and so forth, the company eventually finds itself with an actual value so far in excess of the value exhibited in its balance sheet, the only thing that remains to be done is to sell it out to some new company that will provide it with a new balance sheet and a fat fresh stock issue which will enable it to make a balance sheet which will correspond more closely, more actually, with the real condition of affairs.

One word more about the income tax before I close. I have suggested that true income is a matter of enjoyments, of satisfactions. If I, by working very industriously in my capacity as a financial writer, manage to make $5,000 or $6,000 a year—which I do in good years, not in bad—and by living very carefully am able to save a thousand dollars out of that enormous sum, which requires very careful living, I am taxed upon that entire amount just as if I had blown it all in, and actually enjoyed it, received satisfactions for it. I save a thousand dollars and I lend it to a bank or invest it in some kind of securities, and I do not lose it, and if the bank does not break, or the securities go wrong, what return do I get from it ? I get 3%, 4%, 5%, 6%, or if I am very lucky, 7% income for the remainder of my life, and have the privilege of leaving the thousand dollars to my heirs at my death. I am taxed on the 3%, 4%, 5%, 6%, or 7% income just as I was taxed on the thousand dollars, when I made it, but the 3%, 4%, 5%, 6%, or 7%, is the only real satisfaction I have got. It is not satisfaction to me to own the thousand dollars. It might be a satisfaction if I put it for instance into a house, and used it, but in the form of an investment it is not a satisfaction. By taxing me on that part of my income you are discouraging me from saving, more than I need at the moment, to provide for the future. You are taxing me on what I save as well as on what I actually enjoy. Is it possible, you will say, or the practical politician will say, to tax a man on what he actually enjoys, and not upon his cash income, including what he saves ? Yes, it is perfectly. May I say that in all these remarks on this subject I am quoting the opinions of Professor Irving Fisher, one of the most eminent of American economists, and a man illimitably optimistic because he has undertaken to convert the practical politicians and practical business men of his country to a correct conception of the nature of income, a great and hopeless task. It may be done, but I can hardly conceive that it will be done in his lifetime. He has undertaken to convince them, and I am starting the process of convincing you that a man's true income is that which he spends on his own enjoyments. This thousand dollars that I might last year, if I had been very thrifty, have saved out of my income, I might have put into mining stock, and that mining stock might have gone entirely wrong this year. The Dominion of Canada would have taxed me last year. Would it have rebated me on that loss this year ? No, you know that. Would I have derived any real income in the way of any real satisfaction from the temporary possession of the thousand dollars ? No. If I had lost it during the year in which I made it I might have escaped paying income tax on it, but by losing it a year after I made it, having had the pleasure of having it in my possession over Christmas and New Year's, I am obliged to pay income tax on it before I actually come into possession and enjoyment of it, and then losing it without ever coming into possession and enjoyment of it at all. A true scientific income tax is an income tax which would fall upon the satisfactions that a man secures during the year for which the tax is levied, the money he spends on the satisfaction of his personal desires and those of his family; not his gross income in the sense of every penny that comes under his control, because if he saves a portion of those pennies he may lose them next year, and in any case he is not enjoying them this year. You can tax them when he spends them. If he invests them and derives an income from them for forty years, or a thousand years, tax him every year on that income, but why tax him on them when he has not entered into any enjoyment of them at all ? The process is not difficult. You call on a man to return his actual income, but you call on him to make a return also of the amount which, out of that income he has put aside into permanent investment, in which, I think, should not be included the house in which he lives. It is permanent in a sense, but it is also a satisfaction. So automobiles. But stocks and shares in companies, certainly savings in the bank, certainly anything else which is in the form of deferred spending power, take that from his income as returned, and you have his satisfactions during the year, and you can tax him on that with perfect logic and accuracy and with perfect graduation in the rate at which he should be taxed, because the men who spend largely is obviously in a position to make a larger proportionate contribution for the upkeep of the country than the man who does not spend so largely.

The thanks of the Club were tendered by COLONEL FRASER.

THE ASSAULT ON EVEREST

AN ADDRESS BY N. E. ODELL, A.R.S.M., F.G.S., Etc.

1st March, 1928.

CAPTAIN ODELL was introduced by PRESIDENT FENNELL, and spoke as follows, illustrating his lecture by lantern slides : The Mount Everest expeditions are of an interesting origin. In 1892 a subaltern in the Indian Army, Lieut. Bruce, who was spending a good many of his holidays climbing in the Himalayas, first in the Northwestern Himalayas in Kashmir, conceived the idea of getting up a private expedition to make the attempt on Mount Everest, the highest known summit in the world, and permission was sought for the passage of an expedition to approach the mountain by the natural route from the south, up from India through the State of Nepal to the southern slopes of the mountain; but whenever permission was sought for the passage of an expedition through Nepal, the Nepalese Government steadfastly refused to grant it, Nepal having a special privilege of entirely excluding foreigners. There is just one British resident in the capital of Nepal. Repeated attempts were made to get permission for an expedition, and Lord Curzon when he was Viceroy of India was very keen that the Royal Society should get together a party and make the attempt. Just before he returned to England from his Viceroyalty things began to change. However, the war came on and it was not until 1920 that permission was obtained to approach the mountain from the north, or Thibetan side, through the good offices of Sir Charles Bell, then British Resident in the State of Sikkim. That route was adopted by each of the three expeditions. The first expedition of 1921, which was a reconnaissance, reached a height of 23,000 feet on the northern slope of the mountain. The second expedition of 1922, reached 27,000 feet. Of the third expedition of 1924, with which I was associated, I propose to tell you a little today.

The mountain lies on the northern border of the State of Nepal, between the main Himalayan chain and the great plain of the Ganges, extending over the northern part of India. Our first point to reach was the well-known hill station of Darjeeling. That was our jumping-off point for our long journey of about 300 miles through Sikkim and up the slopes of the mountain. Darjeeling is a most beautiful spot, perched on a little mountain shelf some 17,000 feet above the sea level, a great resort of people from the plains of India. It is on a hillside, with profound valleys reaching down 6,000 feet below the elevation of Darjeeling—between Darjeeling and the great snowy chain of the Himalayas themselves. The dominating feature of this view is the third highest summit in the world, rising to 28,250 feet, constituting one of the very finest mountain views in the world. You look some forty or fifty miles across these deep valleys of Sikkim from which rise wonderfully coloured opalescent mists to that great floating range that lies to the north. At Darjeeling we all foregathered in March, 1924, for this third expedition. Before we left we had to recruit our mountain porters. These were a specially selected group of men who came from the hill districts around, and largely chosen by our leader, Gen. Bruce, the subaltern who originated these expeditions in the '90's. Gen. Bruce is a name which is a by-word in the hill districts of India; he has served in the crack regiments all his life, and we could not have had a better man than he for taking us on the long journey through the mountains. Gen. Bruce celebrated his 58th birthday in Thibet with a very fine bottle of rum 150 years old. (Laughter.) Unfortunately, just after that Gen. Bruce got a bad attack of malaria and had to return to India, a great loss to the expedition, but fortunately we had a very fine man in Col. Norton, who had been with the second expedition in 1922, and had made a high altitude record without an artificial supply of oxygen. Col. Norton had a distinguished career in the war, and he made another high altitude record in this expedition by reaching over 28,000 feet on the mountain. The top of the mountain, I might remind you, is 29,140 feet. Others of the Europeans were Dr. Somerville, and George Mallory, those two in that last tragic party that never returned from their attempt on the summit ; Dover Bruce, a cousin of Gen. Bruce ; Capt. Bell, who took the well-known film of the expedition that has been shown in this country, more particularly in the States for the last two winters, Capt. Bell calling it "The Epic of Everest." We had some 55 of these specially selected porters, who were for use high up on the mountain. They were to help us in pitching our high mountain camps, and we really did not give them very much to do until these camps had to be pitched. We carried them along with us all through Thibet and whenever we wanted very much done around our camps in Thibet we hired local labour. These specially selected men were keen to go on the expedition. There were four or five hundred of them who came to Darjeeling, and greatly disappointed were those who were not selected. Those who were fortunate enough to be selected, the 55 chosen ones, became veritable heroes, and when they returned from this expedition they could get any job they wanted in Darjeeling.

After leaving Darjeeling we got into the deep valleys of Sikkim. Later than the time we went in, these mountain slopes are a feast of colour. They are covered with rhododendrons, azaleas, and other flowering shrubs, and they make the mountain a fairyland. We passed over the high pass into the southern valley of Thibet; we crossed that pass at 15,000 feet above sea level into the Chimney Valley, and reached the Thibetan plateau proper at a little place called Khamba Jong, which is on the trade route from Lhasa to India. Up to this point we had been using mules and ponies, and we now took the yak, which is the main transportation animal of Thibet. This animal is essential to the life of the Thibetan on this high plateau. They have horses and ponies, but the yak is the beast of burden, and he supplies them with his long shaggy coat with plenty of wool (which they export and from which they make their clothes), and also supplies them with milk. The typical man of Thibet wears the long homespun cloak, and trousers to match, and long felt boots, and cap that he can turn down over his ears. The cold winds in Thibet during the better part of the year make that clothing seem hardly adequate. It is an extraordinarily frigid country, yet these people survive with that clothing, which keeps out a certain amount of cold. They wear scarcely anything underneath, and it is remarkable that they survive. The women of Thibet have a strange appearance on account of the extraordinary head-dress which prevails in southern Thibet. In Central Thibet it is somewhat different. This headdress is a frame into which the hair is twisted on each side, and a few hairs are taken from the top of the head up to the frame. As a final touch to their toilet they rub into their head large quantities of melted butter. The people of Thibet are extraordinarily dirty people; they never indulge in anything like washing. Considering the cold climate I suppose it is natural that they should not do too much washing, but water is very scarce in Thibet except for about a couple of months in the year.

Our camp was often submerged in the usual afternoon sandstorm. Every day in Thibet, about midday, there are high winds, carrying dust and sand, often in the form of a blizzard, and making travelling extremely unpleasant. We used to carry out our day's journey as far as possible early in the day and get our camp pitched and comfortable before the midday sandstorm. The sand penetrates food and everything.

Thibet is a land of monasteries. It is estimated that one-third of the total population are llamas or priests, housed in these large monasteries. The religion is Buddhism, but Buddhism largely mixed with the earlier religion of demonology. You see this earlier religion cropping out through the modern Buddhism in such things as the devil dances, a great feature of their religious ceremonies.

We proceeded south in order to reach Mount Everest, and from the pass some 18,000 feet above sea level we got a very fine view of the mountains some forty miles distant. The great elevated plateau of Thibet is 15,000 feet above sea level. These ranges we crossed over go up to 18,000 and 19,000 feet, and on these altitudes we had to become acclimatized before starting for the higher reaches on the mountain itself. When you first reach this high plateau you lose your appetite and cannot sleep. We did not actually suffer from mountain sickness itself, but one suffered from nausea at times, and after about a week or fortnight we were pretty well used to it. Then when we reached the base camp near the mountain, just over 16,000 feet, we had to start our acclimatization all over again, and it was that upper spell of this that was the most trying of all. We made our way through a pass and down certain valleys and came out around the end of a glacier that reaches down from the north face of the mountain. Before reaching that point we passed through an interesting village, one of the highest elevated villages in the world, at 17,000 feet, where there was an interesting Llama who presided over the local monastery, a very holy man very much respected in this part of Thibet, considered a kind of demigod, and his holiness seemed to be largely acquired by spending some 24 years in complete solitude in a cell up in this valley not very far from our base camp. This old man seemed little the worse for his experience; he was a big man looking thoroughly healthy and of good figure. Gen. Bruce, who had been out on the previous expedition, had become great friends with him, and he had been very pleased, in spite of his reincarnation of an earlier Thibetan god, to find he was about the same age as Gen. Bruce. We approached the mountain up the side valley, and we pitched our fourth camp on the side of the mountain, and then two more camps above at 25,000 and 27,000 feet, from which the attacks were made on the summit.

The rocks of these great peaks of the Himalayas are composed of sedimentary rocks that were once laid down at sea level, and have now been up thrust to these immense altitudes of 29,000 feet. Before we could get off from the base camp we had a great many jobs to do. We had to prepare the oxygen apparatus for use on the mountain. I was responsible for this apparatus, and at times we would find it very necessary in making our attacks on the summit. It had a good deal of knocking about on the way out to India and on the backs of the yaks across the plateau, and we had to spend whole evenings, often to the early hours of the morning, repairing it. The upshot of it all was that on the last expedition we found that we were able to acclimatize so thoroughly to these high altitudes that we could almost dispense with the artificial supply of oxygen, and we found the weight of the oxygen apparatus, some thirty-five pounds, entirely offset any advantage we got from the gas. In the last expedition we had the experience of having human beings in these highest altitudes, approaching 30,000 feet, where the atmospheric pressure is less than one-third what it is at the sea level, and the supply of oxygen proportionately less, entirely without an artificial supply of oxygen.

We got off from the base camp and approached the mountain on the northern side where we could walk up along the sides of the glacier. Off to the west was another mountain which we called Bimari, which is the Thibetan for Daughter Peak. We named that after Mallory's daughter. He wanted to call it Dorothy Peak, but we decided to call it in Thibetan, and the best we could do was Bimari.

An immense cloud banner, which was a constant feature of the main peak, indicated constant winds. Just over the shoulder a mile or so we found a sheltered recess where we were able to pitch our No. 2 camp at 20,000 feet, that is, No. 2 above the base camp. That was one of the cosiest spots we had on the whole trip. It looked pretty frigid, but this great wall of ice gave us protection from the cold north winds; we got plenty of sun, and we used to come down from our exposed camps on the mountain and think this quite a Riviera. (Laughter.) Above this camp we had to get out on the open surface of the glacier and it was here that we had considerable difficulty in finding the way in and out among those gigantic ice pinnacles which are a great feature of the glaciers of the tropics. Later we reached a long line of the moraine which formed a very convenient causeway for our passage up and down the glacier. It was pretty rough going but it was infinitely preferable to going up and down these pinnacles. The most remarkable thing there was the ice scenery. We followed this trough two or three miles to the glacier and at each side were immense walls of ice which were being slowly melted into all manner of fantastic shapes, many of them rising some hundred feet above their beds. We followed this trough upward until it gave out on the open surface of the glacier, where it was necessary to adopt the usual precaution of roping up, and we made our way to Camp 3, which we pitched at some 21,250 feet above sea level. When we pitched this camp we were in for a very bad spell of weather; we had temperatures to 25 below, always with a high wind. I know that is not very much in this country perhaps, but 25 below with a high wind, and over 20,000 feet, is a very different matter from that temperature at sea level. We got a good many cases of frost bite here, and it was some time before we could go on and get our next camp established.

The North Call is a great wall of ice and snow, some 1,300 feet in altitude from its base, and was the scene of a very bad accident to the previous expedition of 1922, when an avalanche had come down from those slopes and carried down the party, and unfortunately some porters lost their lives. Mallory and Simpson nearly lost theirs also. We were particularly anxious on this last occasion to get a safer route if we could find one, and Mallory, Norton and I made a route on a steep slope, so we had to do a good deal of step-cutting, until we came to an immense wall of ice which looked as if it was going to cut us off from access to the higher slopes.

But Mallory decided to lead us up the face of it, by a magnificent piece of mountain craft, and then we managed to make our way with other various minor difficulties till we reached the top of the North Call. We used a rope ladder, which we devised, and that became the regular way up and down from the camp, and it was away from the parts of the slope most liable to avalanche. Then we got our North Call camp fixed at 23,000 feet and that became the advanced post of the expedition. After we got that camp fixed we were driven back to lower camps on two occasions, and to the base camp, once owing to the extremely bad storms we were experiencing at that time. It was not only when the monsoon comes on, the monsoon that brings the heavy rains of India and the heavy falls of snow in the Himalayas, that you normally expect bad weather, but in this particular year 1924 we were experiencing such bad weather that we thought the monsoon had arrived at an unprecedentedly early period. All through May we had atrocious weather conditions, low temperatures added to these blizzards, and it made the pitching of these high camps almost impossible. After we had been beaten back to the base camp we set off again as a very much reduced party, only fifteen out of our 55 porters available, the latter part of the time, for use high up the mountain, and the rest were down and out of it with frostbite, mountain sickness or other indispositions owing to the bad conditions we had been experiencing. Some of our own European climbing party also were exhausted.

We made our attempt from North Call the latter part of May, and after Mallory and Gen. Bruce had gone away up this north region of the mountain and pitched a camp at 25,000 feet. They had to retreat owing to the porters' refusal to go on, also because Bruce had strained his heart in carrying some of the porters' load in addition to his own share. They were followed up by Norton and Somerville, who spent a night at this camp, and next day their porters made their way into the clouds and at 27,000 feet pitched the highest camp that has ever been pitched on this world's surface. (Applause.) They spent the night there, and strange to relate Norton records that he had a very good night and slept well. Before this expedition started physiologists had said we should be able to sleep at about 21,000 feet. That was one little bit of physiological evidence we had gleaned. The porters were sent down from that high camp and the next day Norton and Somerville made their way on towards the summit. You can only go a few steps and then stop and gasp for breath. You take as many as eight or nine or ten respirations every step you go. Somerville on this occasion was suffering very much from his bad throat and was coughing up large clots of blood. They were going extremely slowly. Mountaineering difficulties were not excessive, nevertheless; atmospheric conditions were almost insuperable. However, at midday they had reached the top of the wall of rock at 28,000 feet above sea level. At that point Somerville broke down. He was able to take some rather remarkable photographs, especially one looking out over the top of the mountains to the westward of Everest, from the immense elevation of 28,000 feet. Then he took the last photograph of Norton, who decided to go on alone in an attempt to reach the summit. Norton eventually reached a spot in the great gully that goes down between the final pyramid of the mountain and the northern shoulder, and then, to his bitter disappointment, he had to turn back. It was getting late in the afternoon, he thought the way was clear ahead of him, but he realized that at the pace he was going he would never make the summit and get back to Somerville, about whose condition he was very anxious, before nightfall. He went back from that spot, which we later estimated to be about 28,100 feet above sea level. The spot was actually located and determined by theodolite from the base camp, knowing the height of the mountain. He got back to Somerville, found him somewhat recovered, and they started on their long descent down the north ridge of the snow, and got in late on the evening that Mallory and I had gone up to meet them. We brought them down in the dark to North Call camp, and then after large quantities of hot soup, which Irvine had been brewing in our absence, they were able to tell us all about this record attempt on the summit of the mountain.

We were now daily expecting the arrival of the real monsoon; knowing that when it came we should have to leave the mountain, for it would be quite impossible to carry on with the heavy falls of snow that always come with the first stages of the monsoon. However, Mallory was determined to put in one last attempt on the summit, and with Irvine as his companion he started off from North Call on the 6th of June. Somerville and Norton had not used the oxygen apparatus on account of the degree of acclimatization which we had reached, and partly on account of the fact that we had not sufficient oxygen cylinders available, owing to the shortage of porters; but mainly on account of the fact that we had so far acclimatized that the weight of the apparatus seemed to offset any particular advantage we got from the oxygen gas. But Mallory determined in this last attack to use every means available, and they took out the oxygen apparatus, a modified form of it that Irvine and I had got together, cutting out one cylinder and modifying the breathing apparatus considerably. They spent their first night out upon the North Call at Camp 5, and then the next day they made their way to Camp 6. They took their porters with them, and these porters the night they reached Camp 6 returned and brought me a message from Mallory which said they used very little oxygen, they had traveled very well, and all conditions seemed very promising in their attack on the summit next day. I had come up to Camp 5; I was following them up in support and also doing geological work at this time, and that night I slept at Camp 5. The next morning the two porters with me said they were suffering from mountain sickness and could not carry on, and so I had to take them some way down the ridge of the mountain to the North Call camp. Then I turned up again and went on up towards

Camp 6 that Mallory and Irvine had slept at, and from which they started this same morning in their attack on the summit. It was a misty day and I could see little of the upper parts of the mountain. Very soon after midday there was a certain clearing and I looked up and there I saw two little specks moving up a snowy slope and approaching a rock step, a particular rock step that we had noted in all our calculations as to how long we should take to reach certain points on the ridge of the mountain and how long it would take from those points to reach the summit. This particular step I saw them approaching; I was very surprised to see that they had only reached this spot at this hour, soon after midday, which they should have reached, according to Mallory's time table, at about eight o'clock in the morning. I was very surprised to see they were late, but they still seemed to be moving very briskly; they were moving one at a time up the snowy slope, and it did not look by any means as if they were at the end of their tether. Then the clouds came down and I could see them no more. I made my way up to Camp 6, and I reached there just as the blizzard came on. I took shelter in a tent, and then decided to go on up above the camp to the slopes above, and as I went I shouted and whistled, to give direction to Mallory and Irvine, who I thought might be returning. Then I realized that they must be well above this, and very possibly might be above this patch of bad weather I was experiencing,—they might be well up on the cone of the mountain some thousand to two thousand feet high. Then I got back to Camp 6 and waited there some time, and I remembered Mallory particularly requested me not to remain up at that high altitude at Camp 6; there was no room actually in the single little tent which held two only at a pinch; he wanted me to get back to the North Call camp, as he was going to return there that night if possible in order that he might denude that camp and get down the North Call slopes before the monsoon broke. I was responsible at this time for that North Call camp and running operations above it and below it, and taking parties up and down, and I felt bound to get back there to look after the porters who were stationed at the North Call. I got back that night, and I looked for signs of Mallory and Irving returning, some light from the mountain. There was none. Next morning at midday I decided to go up and search. I saw no movement through my glasses at Camp 6 above me. I went up. I took with me one porter, but very soon he broke down, and I had to send him back. I reached Camp 5 that night and spent the night there; tried to sleep but it was too cold to sleep. I had two sleeping bags, one inside the other, and all my clothes, and then I was cold. There was a violent wind all night, threatening to uproot the tent. In the morning I went on up and late in the afternoon of the next day I reached Camp 6. I found the tiny tent there had collapsed in the gale, but there were no signs that Mallory and Irvine had returned in my absence. I decided to go on above, and I searched all the slopes as far as I could, but I could only see a few yards ahead of me owing to the violence of the gale and the blizzard that was prevailing at this time. I realized that one might search those slopes for a very much longer time, in fact might search with a larger party and then not come across the remains of the missing party. So I decided it was necessary to get back as I was responsible for these porters on the North Call camp. I got back that evening. We could launch no further search party as we were all down and out at this time; and just after this the monsoon broke, preventing our launching an attack on the mountain, or searching for our missing companions.

Mallory and Irvine had left Camp 6 on the morning when I saw them as mentioned, going by way of this ridge, and I felt from what one saw of the other part of the mountain that very probably they would find no obstacles ahead of them, no difficulty from the technical point of view, and it is very probable that they had made the summit and something may have gone wrong on the way down. As to what it was, one can only guess, but knowing the skill of Mallory and Irvine it is pretty difficult to conclude that they had fallen and met their death. I feel satisfied that probably having made the summit, they would make their way down in the late afternoon, and then in the gathering gloom and darkness they would be unable to reach either Camp 6 or Camp 5 and would have to take shelter in some recess on this great north face, and then from exhaustion they would undoubtedly fall asleep and in the great cold of that high altitude would undoubtedly freeze to death in their sleep. That, I think, is just as possible an explanation, but of course it is only a guess as to what befel them. Some suggested that the failure of the oxygen apparatus may have been their undoing, but I do not think so, because I used the oxygen on my second trip up to Camp 6 and was able to switch it off at just short of 27,000 feet, and carry on entirely without its use. I do not think that even if the oxygen apparatus failed that Mallory and Irvine would have been prevented from returning.

That, gentlemen, is a short account of this expedition, and it is the intention of the Mount Everest Committee, members of the Royal Geographical Society, and the Alpine Club of London, to send out another expedition when we can get permission from Thibet. Another expedition should definitely make certain of the top, and carry on the scientific work that has been going on in these expeditions. We have failed so far to get permission from Thibet, but we do hope in the next few years that that permission will be obtained, and another expedition will go out and make certain of the top.

Some of you may have wondered what is the use of these expeditions that so often, and this time in particular, are followed by the loss of human life. Some think the death of Mallory and Irvine useless sacrifice. Surely that is not the case. In a material age they died in pursuit of an ideal, and there is surely many a worse thing to die for than in the pursuit of such an ideal. I think that it is very necessary to remember in these days that such a pursuit as mountaineering should be carried on by us as Britishers, and it would be a poor thing for the British Empire and for the world if the love of adventure and pioneering should die out. (Applause.) I hope, gentlemen, that the next expedition will be successful. There have been several plans for other countries to run an expedition to make the attempt —Japan, United States of America, Italy, have all mooted expeditions, but I hope during the next few years it will be a British expedition that definitely reaches the top of the world. (Applause.)

The thanks of the Club were tendered to the speaker by BRIG.-GEN. MITCHELL.

A SANE SCHEME OF COLONIZATION

AN ADDRESS BY C. A. MAGRATH, M.E.I.C.

15th March, 1928.

The speaker was introduced by PRESIDENT FENNELL, and said : In taking up this question of colonization, my intention is first to make it clear to you why I think I am justified in talking about such an important subject. I intend then to show you that colonists have always been financed, principally by indirect methods. I shall then lead on to my belief that the time has arrived when Canada must courageously take hold of the colonizing of this country, using its credit to that end. (Hear, hear.) We must believe if we talk seriously, that newcomers will be an asset to the country. There is no one in this room that wants to see people brought in who will not be an asset to this country, to join us in becoming citizens and to work out a destiny that will be fitted for Canada. And in saying that I believe I am saying a great deal indeed.

Well, then, Mr. President, let me say that next month it will be fifty years since I passed through this city on my way to Northwestern Canada to join a survey party. It took us five weeks to reach the neighbourhood of the present city of Saskatoon. I have seen buffalo grazing there. In October of that year we had worked westward into what is now known as the Province of Alberta. That was in 1878. From that time on I lived a great many years on the plains of Western Canada. In 1885 I entered the service of a company that was formed a couple of years previously by Sir Alexander Galt, then High Commissioner in London. Speaking of the company, we were pioneers in coal mining. Galt coal today is a domestic fuel very extensively used from Winnipeg on the east to Nelson on the west in British Columbia and down to Spokane and other points to the south of the boundary. In the recent trials of Alberta domestic fuels in Ontario, Galt coal was not brought here because the only coals that reached this province were from the lands of the Canadian National Railway. We built something in the neighbourhood of 400 miles of railway, narrow gauge at first, afterward standardized. Over 100 miles of these roads were in the State of Montana where we were seeking a market for our coal. We came into possession of over a million acres of land, and it was my special business to look after that land, and endeavour to get rid of it to settlers, and to that end we became pioneers in irrigation development in Western Canada, building some 120 miles of main irrigation canals.

Sir Alexander Galt as a young man came to Canada and took hold of some colonization work in the Eastern Townships south of Montreal, and very successfully. His father before him undertook the colonization of the territory from Guelph to Goderich. John Galt was dragged, literally dragged, out of this country by his directors, because he undertook to spend their money in giving employment to the settlers in building roads and bridges, but it was discovered afterwards that John Galt was absolutely sound in his methods. (Applause.) Last year I was at Guelph when the city which he founded was celebrating its hundred years, and the tributes were all paid to John Galt. No one ever heard the name mentioned of a director of his company. (Laughter.) Now these Galts, father and son, Sir Alexander and Elliott, were founders of the present city of Lethbridge in Alberta. These men had in them the instincts of the colonizer. Last year the Lethbridge *Herald* in its Confederation number had a long article on the founder of the city, Sir Alexander Galt, as one of the Fathers of Confederation; and by the way, the writer ran across one of our early settlers who said, speaking of Sir Alexander Galt, "The old gentleman was always interested in us; he seemed in some way to feel that he was responsible for us." Gentlemen, therein is the root and secret of sound colonization methods. (Hear, hear, and applause.) The man who has an appreciation of his fellow-man and sufficient intelligence to see what his fellow-man is trying to do as a pioneer, and a willingness to stand behind that man as far as it is practicable to do so, understands colonization. It was under those auspices that I took hold of the land of which I have spoken.

At a later period the Galts retired from that organization and it passed into other hands. The settlement policy changed and I resigned; otherwise I suppose I would be in that country still. If you will observe, John Galt gave employment to the settlers. He had the financial idea there, the indirect method of assisting them. It was not long ago that I had the opportunity of looking at a letter written at Belleville ninety years ago, and the letter was praying that the Government of the day would spend some more money on navigation canals in order to circulate a little more money among the people. There you have again the idea of financing. Bacon three hundred years ago understood this problem. He appreciated that in the planting of settlers it was necessary to finance them and he said that the commercial mind was not suitable for planting settlers, because the man so endowed wanted interest on his money yearly, whereas, he said, the nobility were willing to wait the 14 or 15 years that it took to root these people on the land. In my judgment that requires only about a third of the time today. In the work we did in Southern Alberta, we were, as I told you, pioneers in irrigation, and we gave employment to the settlers, paying them half cash and half land. There again you get the idea of financing indirectly. We sold the land at $3 an acre, irrigated lands which today are worth $50 an acre. So I think I have made clear what I believe to be absolutely true, whether we recognize the fact or not, that in the planting of people it is essential to take the human point of view in respect of them, and helping carry them through until they get rooted on the land. (Applause.)

Towards the end of last century and the beginning of this, there seemed to be a wave of prosperity passing over the whole world. Vast numbers of people came into Western Canada. We had a Minister of Immigration who courageously let the world know that we had free lands; and we gave away millions of acres of some of the finest lands to be found in any country in the world. At that particular period we seemed to be passing through a mad era of railway construction. I am not saying that offensively at all, but we were circulating money in the country, and there again you get the idea of the settlers' being able to fall back upon some organization that was distributing money and bringing money into the country. Now, gentlemen, we have pioneers; pioneers are not people who have money. A man who has money usually wants to stay in the country where he has been brought up. Most of our western settlers, in my judgment, come into that country so close to insolvency, that it is to the credit of the banks and the mortgage companies that they do as much as they do for the settlers. (Applause.)

At the end of the war we seemed to have the ball at our feet: but the cry was then addressed to all governments to spend no money. To my mind it was most unsound; development problems called for money expenditures, and instead of waiting, as it seemed we were, until these small Balkan states found their feet and we could all go forward together, we should have been actively taking up the question of colonizing this country long ago. So far as the present system is concerned, I would say this in fairness to the Minister of Immigration, that he can get the same results, whatever those results may be, as his immediate predecessors under the immigration system to which he has fallen heir. If we look back forty years, this country was kept warm by the use of wood. There was no coal burned in Canada forty years ago, of any consequence, and my own view is that we could use wood in the early winter and in the spring season, to our own advantage in taking care of our unemployment in these long winters. But it is not convenient to use wood, and besides that is only a minor national problem and no one has any time to give it any consideration. However, forty years ago we were using wood, and one cord per day was about as much as we could expect to be sawn. Today we can get 25 cords of wood sawn in a day. The system has changed. That is what is needed in connection with this colonization idea. The system has to be changed. We have got to come up to modern methods, we have got to have courage and belief in our own country and make use of the credit of our country if we wish to place people in the country. (Applause.)

I have been asked to refer to some colonization views expressed by some of our leading men. For instance, Sir Henry Thornton recently suggested that the railway tariffs might be increased, as I remember, five per cent., by which they would obtain some twenty million dollars a year, to be used for colonization. Now one of our weaknesses is a tendency to worry over details, rather than dealing with principles. It is the greatest weakness we human beings seem to possess. First let us determine principles. So far as I am concerned I am entirely in agreement with Sir Henry Thornton when he says we need to put money into this in a big way. Only a few days ago Gen. McRae came forward with an idea, having in view the reclaiming of some of our marginal lands, lands adjoining our timbered areas. But again I say, do not let us worry about details. He wants the credit of the country to the extent of three hundred million dollars, and as I have confidence in this country and in the foundation stock of this country I am ready to endorse him in his suggestion.

Since the autumn of 1923 I have at odd times been discussing this question of colonization. My idea of course is that we should not attempt anything of the character I have been referring to unless we can get some of the very best minds of the country into an organization, men with high patriotic views. I believe we have men of the younger generation, men of great administrative ability, who could take hold of a problem of this character and safeguard every dollar that goes into it. Otherwise, as far as I am concerned, no money, unless you have the brains, unless you have the integrity plus the capacity; and this country has that, I am proud to say. (Applause.)

My view is that a national organization should seek people wishing to make their home on the land, giving preference to our own Canadians; next in order, British settlers, followed by people from other selected countries. That is a task for a great national colonizing organization, in which the credit of the country should be used. I believe I can see the day when, instead of $300,000,000, we might have $500,000,000 in that character of work. Everything would depend upon the sanity of the organization. Unless, as I have said, we get that, then let us keep out of it.

My opinion is that colonization should be divided into two heads. We should have the defensive branch, under the political head, the defensive branch being the branch that holds the sieve, through which people must pass before they can come in here to become citizens of this country. The offensive branch to be under the organization that I have referred to, the non-political organization. Money, as I see it, should not be spent in beating the woods in foreign countries to drive people into this country. Money should be spent in this country to help establish those people in becoming citizens of Canada. (Applause.) I believe by the adoption of such a policy we shall find people only too anxious to try it out in Canada.

The sanest speech I have run across in connection with this colonization movement was made in this city last June by the Chief Justice of this province, Sir William Mulock. It consisted of only about half a dozen lines but he evidently knows how to put much in little, because he cautioned his hearers to maintain in Canada our foundation stock,—and I do not have to tell you where they come from—a strong, virile people, and he added these significant words : "A vacant house is far better than a bad tenant." I think that was an exceedingly able remark. (Hear, hear.) It is an easy matter to hold the sieve at our ports, but on this long boundary between Canada and the United States it is an entirely different matter. The United States has not adopted the quota system through any accident. It is because they allowed people to come into their country in vast numbers; for many years before the war they were coming in at the rate of a million a year. I am not saying anything against our neighbours, for they are a great people, but they themselves admit that they have in their centres of population types of people that would be absolutely dangerous to us, and as we grow and prosper they will be heading for the boundary and getting across unless we develop that defensive system I refer to, that sieve. It is not going to be done in a week. We have got to have an organization united with the cities and the boundaries and back to the central organization, the lines leading throughout the country. We must know who is to come into this country. We must place them, and in that way protect ourselves against those who would do much to destroy us. A few drops of strychnine in a pail of water may amount to very little, but put them in a glass of water, and it is a different story. I feel that we should be at that today, because as I say, it will take a number of years to bring it to a proper basis.

In respect to the service that would be engaged in planting people in Canada, I would invite your attention to the work of the Hydro Electric Power Commission. (Applause.) You cannot blame me for taking advantage of the occasion to let you know something about an institution that is functioning in your midst. What is the policy ? What is the system ? We have to determine whether the province needs more power; we have to make up our mind where to get it in the best interests of the province; we have to determine what it will cost; then we go to the provincial government and say, "There is the situation; we need more power; there is where we think it should be obtained." It is the function of the Government to say "Yes" or "No". It is the privilege of the Government to say "No", but once it says "Yes", and the Legislature votes the money, then we run it after that; and if we do not carry on that work aright, when we come with the next project the Government would probably say "No." Now I apply that system to a great national organization in colonization work. If we get into that organization a man of great administrative ability, common sense would lead him to believe that he must link up every province of Canada. That is the way you can draw people. He would call on each province to submit, or would give them the opportunity to submit projects to him. Each province would select land suitable for settlement. He would say: "I have got the money, I have got the organization." The provinces would submit to him projects of land not exceeding, say, six miles square, or ten miles square, so that he could have a Supervisor that could work within that area and look after the people in that area. Naturally he would call upon the Provinces to supply the lands,—to tell you where the lands could be had. In a selected block there might be fifty per cent. suitable for settlement. Market conditions, soil conditions, all the conditions necessary to enable a man to get a square deal on the land would be carefully ascertained. There has been too much of that wild business of running all over the shop and getting people on land on which they cannot make a living. I would call on the province for those details; I would bring that material together in the form of a specification, and in that specification would be a financial statement as to the amount of money necessary to look after that project. You might have to buy those lands; you might have to do what Gen. McRae suggests, using the money in clearing free lands, but all this would be set out in a financial statement. When that passed my proposed organization I would send that in as we send our hydro projects in to the province; I would send that to the Minister of Immigration, and it would be his function to say "Yes" or "No". He would have his own organization pass upon it, and if they came to the conclusion it was a sound project and suitable for settlement then he would pass it. With that I would expect to get from the Parliament of Canada the authority to issue land settlement bonds up to an amount not exceeding what the financial statement in that specification shows, that is, bonds to be issued as and when needed for looking after those people.

Now gentlemen, we seem to be alarmed when we talk about $300,000,000 or $500,000,000, we seem to be afraid that we are going to get all that money spent and something may happen that we will not get the money back. You know very well that if in dealing with one project the organization is not making a success, the time they go back for the second or third project the Minister will say, "We don't think so." So there is not that danger that we sometimes seem to apprehend that if we adopt a system of that kind we are suddenly going to get three million dollars out and we may never get it back. The type of men I am thinking of do not use money like drunken sailors, they will move slowly and cautiously until they see the method that gets the best results, and if they are getting the results then they will move forward with a good deal of force. (Applause.) Today the Hydro Commission has behind it nearly two hundred million dollars of the money of the Province, and it is safe. (Applause.) It is only a few weeks since the Provincial Government had to borrow money for the Temiskaming Railway. There is nothing more sensitive to adverse wind than capital, we all know that, and yet they offered those bonds for a shade over four per cent, and capital showed that it is not very much afraid of the credit of this Province. That is the evidence. The same thing would apply in the other situation. The idea of Canada being afraid to lend its credit for $300,000,000 to get the right type of people into this country, to me is inconceivable, when this Province has already given its credit to the tune of $200,000,000, and will have to a considerable amount more before long.

The cry is frequently heard that we must have no paternalism in connection with our newcomers. The cry is not based on knowledge and experience. I have lived among settlers, I have gone in amongst them, I have seen the dug-out conditions under which they live, and to think that they are trying to build up Canada—building for themselves, it is true, but doing work in building up this country—and to talk about using a little money to help them along so long as they are willing to stay out there on the land, to talk about it as paternalism, is to my mind inept. People who talk that way do not understand the problems and difficulties settlers have to contend with. (Applause.) Some of our successful settlers would say, I suppose, that I do not know much about the subject because I have not farmed. As a matter of fact, I have. In 1903 or 1904 I believe I got the first wheat, the earliest wheat on the market, the earliest fall wheat. I shipped out a carload on the 6th of August, I think it was, and as far as I know I was the first on the market. However, I did not stay at it very long, because I did not find it very profitable. (Laughter and applause.) Very successful settlers say, "Why shouldn't the newcomers of today do as we did? We made the grade without any assistance. I am not altogether sure they are correct; I am not altogether sure, but the people who make that statement were in the country when there were vast sums of money being circulated, and reaching them indirectly through those railways and expenditures I have referred to. But they cannot deny this, that every man has to make the grade the first three or four years; it is a difficult grade; they stall on the grade, they struggle on the grade. I do not care how successful a man is today, that is his history and he will admit it, and say if there was a booster on that grade and he had got up and made the grade two years earlier, he would have been producing wealth for his country during the two years that this country lost. (Applause.)

The planting of people is very similar to the planting of an orchard. You go to the nursery and you select your trees. You plant them. You cultivate them; you care for them until they take root. Then what happens? They commence to produce for whom?

for the man who has the orchard. That man is not deterred from doing that because he knows that a certain proportion of those trees will not take root. That is the history of all planting. He has to pay for the trees that have not taken root, he has his time expended in that work, which he loses, but he knows that the trees which do take root will produce for him and pay him for it. The suggestion has been made that Canada is in the place of the man who owns the orchard, because the successful settlers become tax-payers for all of Canada, and therefore it is the credit of all the country that should be used in helping establish them. But frequently the statement is made, "Why don't our railway corporations do this work?" They have no money with which they can take care of those who fail; they cannot call upon the successful to pay for the unsuccessful.

We can talk colonization, but as I say we will never get anywhere until we take hold of it pretty much along the lines I have suggested, the indirect financing of settlers, which nobody seems to have seen was the courageous way of saying this country is worth settling with the people we want in this country. It cannot be jumped into quickly; it has got to be developed slowly. We have got to buy our experience. If I were responsible for immigration I would endeavour as a preliminary step to enlist the services of a man like Sir Herbert Ames. He is absolutely out of Canadian politics today, he is living in the neighborhood of Boston, he is interested in the League of Nations. During the war he organized the Patriotic Fund, and he did it well. He went over and took hold of the finances of the League of Nations; I am told he did it magnificently. He is an organizer, he is a capable man, and he is known in every capital of Europe. I would be disposed to take a man like that as a preliminary step, and tell him to come back to me in six months and tell me something about the nature of the organization, the type of organization, needed. He knows where the people are. I would place before him certain stated questions as to the necessity of applying the quota system in Canada, the sources of supply of people we would get; and I think probably at the end of six months he might illuminate those questions in such a way that we might see our way to move forward a little more rapidly than we have been moving. We Canadians seem to deplore the fact that people are not coming to Canada as they have been going to the United States. On the whole I think we have been very fortunate. The hurricane method has decided disadvantages. They have been blown in to our neighbors at a terrific rate, and they have adopted the quota system. We are of course drifting along and in time new people will invade us in great numbers. There is no question about Canada getting people if we wait, but they will invade us in great numbers as they did the United States. We have not reached the period when they will come to us as they have been going to the United States, but the period is coming, and that is another reason I say we want to have some organization to control it, and not be forced at the last moment, as our neighbors have been forced, to get a quota system to protect ourselves. (Applause.)

My last word to a patient audience is to remember Sir William Mulock's advice, Maintain your foundation stock, and a vacant house is better than a bad tenant. (Applause.)

The thanks of the club were tendered by Sir William Hearst.

THE ST. LAWRENCE DEEP WATERWAY PROJECT:

A CANADIAN VIEW OF ITS ECONOMIC ASPECTS.

An Address by PROFESSOR W. W. GOFORTH.
Montreal

22nd March, 1928

Introduced by President Fennell, Mr. Goforth said: I have been informed by some of my Toronto friends that they are surprised that anyone from Montreal should dare to discuss the St. Lawrence Project except in terms of rank abuse. I assure you, however, that there are scores of Montreal engineers, lawyers, business men and even a few academic souls like myself who have come to the conclusion that this great scheme of improved communication and electrical development must inevitably be proceeded with, that it is now only a question of time and the proper methods; and that it must be treated not as a political foot-ball to be kicked and abused, but as a future certainty, which must be carefully studied in all its complicated detail, so as to adapt the process of its development to the most efficient service of industrial and social requirements as they arise in the path of this nation's progress. We also fully realize, and are frequently reminded by certain of our Honourable Senators, and others, that every care must be exercised to prevent any infringement of our territorial entity or impairment of our sovereign jurisdiction over land or water, power or navigation rights which lie within our borders, or which properly constitute our equity in the potential electrical wealth of the St. Lawrence River.

There are few, even among the most optimistic supporters of the Deep Waterway Project, who would question the statements of the Honourable Messrs. Graham and Reid that there are serious obstacles to be surmounted, and thorny problems to be solved before we can safely and profitably embark on this great venture. Inordinate haste—and immature decisions based upon a brief and superficial study are certainly to be avoided at all costs. At the same time public apathy and indifference or unreasoning opposition and indefinite procrastination are almost equally harmful. Our progress as a nation has not been marked by the philosophy of Aesop's frog who waited for the fly to enter his mouth, but by a vigorous series of great forward steps, by an ambitious and optimistic bridging of physical barriers, by the transforming of natural obstacles such as our waterfalls and rapids into the motive energy of our industrial life.

It can hardly be questioned that this deep-waterway project with its by-product to Canada alone of nearly 4,000,000 horse power is such a forward step,—that it has been more exhaustively studied and scrutinized, —and that its potential advantages as well as its dangers have been more carefully weighed than in the case of any previous measure of similar importance in our history as a Dominion. There were quite as many preachers of "blue-ruin" when the Pacific Railroad was being discussed fifty odd years ago as there are to-day with reference to the St. Lawrence question.

Now I feel that the best way to deal with this question, to make it intelligible in so brief an allotment of time is first to give you the most important objections to the project on the various vital issues involved, and then to indicate what appear to be the most constructive answers to these objections. I wish it to be clearly understood that I am not here to propagandize for the deep waterway, but merely to state my considered opinion after careful study in my own particular field which is that of power, and after consultation with several authorities, far more competent than myself, to pronounce on their respective spheres of study. I do not claim that these answers are final or complete, nor that in every case a valid reply can yet be given. If there is any value in them, it is that they are suggestive rather than dogmatic.

Nor do I believe that the Joint Engineering Board, or the International Joint Commission, or your own Hydro Commission in its excellent report of 1921, or the National Advisory Committee, from what has leaked out of its recommendations, has said the last and best word on these objections. Much more of intensive study and research will have to be carried out before we can safely and profitably embark upon this gigantic venture, and needless to say such study should be of the strictly uninfluenced variety.

I have listed nine objections which I think cover at least the most vital points. I make no attempt at giving them in any definite order of logical sequence.

(1) That the accepted estimate of $650,000,000 would inevitably be exceeded as in the case of numerous other canal projects of similar magnitude.

(2) That it would result in little or no decrease in costs (and therefore rates) for the movement of grain and other commodities from the Head of the Lakes to their ultimate markets, because transhipment at Montreal would still be necessary, and ocean vessels would not ply up to Lake ports.

(3) That Montreal would suffer as an entrepôt centre by the alternative of through navigation.

(4) That it would shorten the navigation season on the Lower St. Lawrence by inducing earlier surface freezing through the elimination of rapids between Montreal and Prescott.

(5) That the ultimate establishment of an United States controlled "Canal Zone" would be the inevitable result of the project if proceeded with.

(6) That as far as the United States is concerned the project is nothing but a "power steal" with insidious possibilities of injuring rather than benefiting the navigation facilities of the Canadian outlet in order to enhance the competitive position of American Atlantic ports against Montreal and Quebec City.

(7) That Canada could not absorb such a vast increment of power as her share of the whole development would involve. (Such share being nearly 4,000,000 installed h.p.)

(8) That export of the power to the United States would thus be unavoidable, and in some quarters is actually recommended.

(9) That it would place an extra per-capita burden upon the Canadian taxpayer without any proportionate compensation, in other words, that its cost even at the $650,000,000 is, considering all points of view, economically prohibitive.

(1) *First Objection.* That the accepted estimate of $650,000,000 would inevitably be exceeded as in the case of numerous other canal projects of similar magnitude.

Reply: In dealing with the first objection it is necessary to point out first that the estimate is for the more expensive of the alternative schemes, namely, the two-stage plan known as "Plan B" in your Hydro Commissioner's report of 1921, with the canals of the international section on the Canadian side, and that it covers all costs including full development of power as well as navigation works for a 25 foot waterway. The analogy which has been drawn between other canal projects is hardly valid, as those which have been cited in comparison were nearly all constructed during periods of rising prices. The Suez during the period of 1847 to 1871, when the prices of industrial commodities in Europe such as iron and steel, were rising abruptly, and the Panama and Kiel were similarly built during the general price rise from 1896 to 1914. When we examine the probable trend of prices for the next two decades during which the St. Lawrence Deep Waterway will almost certainly be proceeded with, we find practically all monetary experts agreed that there will either be a gradually declining level if we are dependent upon the technical extent of the gold supply (see Gustav Cassell's second memorandum on "The World's Monetary Problems"), or at least a stationary level of prices if we are, as Mr. Montagu suggests, dependent upon the credit policy of the Federal Reserve Board. It may interest you to know that the confidential estimate of the engineers retained by a private syndicate seeking the Power Charter for one of the three sections in the St. Lawrence scheme, are substantially lower than those of the Joint Engineering board for that section. I think we may, therefore, safely assume that the estimate of $650,000,000 is a reasonable maximum upon which we may pretty definitely rely.

(2) *Second Objection,* That it would result in little or no decrease in costs (and therefore rates) for the movement of grain and other commodities from the Head of the Lakes to their ultimate markets, because transhipment at Montreal would still be necessary, and ocean vessels would not ply up to Lake Ports.

To answer this question fully, would enable us to dispose of several other objections, so I propose to deal with numbers (3) and (4) jointly with number (2), namely,

(3) That Montreal would suffer as an entrepôt centre by the alternative of through navigation.

(4) That it would shorten the navigation season on the Lower St. Lawrence by including earlier surface freezing through the elimination of rapids between Montreal and Prescott.

Reply: Perhaps it will be simpler if I deal with the physical objection of number (4) first. In this connection I consulted Dr. Howard Barnes, celebrated physicist, knowing him to be a foremost authority on ice problems in general, and particularly those of the St. Lawrence River. His opinion briefly is this : That the objection is valid in that the replacing of rapids by slow flowing, damned-up pools, would cause a slightly earlier surface freezing, a matter of possibly one week at the end of the navigation season. But he went much further and showed that works which may be combined at very slight extra expense with the whole St. Lawrence improvement scheme, would not only offset the disadvantage just mentioned, but in his opinion, would *prolong* the present navigation season on the Lower St. Lawrence, both above and below Montreal for several weeks. He explained that the two chief factors in the rapid cooling of Lake Ontario waters as they pass down the St. Lawrence, are, first, the still shallows around the Thousand Islands, and, secondly by the icy waters of the Ottawa River, which enter the St. Lawrence both on the east and west sides of the Island of Montreal. These he states could be very easily eliminated, with actual improvement of present power and navigation conditions, by strategically located dams to concentrate the flow of the river into a main channel at the Thousand Islands, by blocking the St. Anne's rapids on the west side of Montreal Island, and by utilizing the natural submarine ridge extending for a considerable distance from the westward tip of the island. He would accomplish this by merely filling in the ridge to water level, thus effectively separating the Ottawa waters from the St. Lawrence to within striking distance of tide water.

Now we turn to the question of whether Ocean vessels will or will not pass through Montreal as a result of the improved waterway. There is extreme divergence of opinion on this point, but I have found on the whole that engineers and others who have approached the subject with an open and "uninfluenced" mind, have come to substantially similar conclusions. While I do not claim that this estimate is final and strictly accurate from the viewpoint of quantities, yet it is at least suggestive. In the first place, ocean liners on account of their much higher ratio of overhead expenditure would almost certainly not go above Montreal, however great the improvements in St. Lawrence navigation. Secondly, the specialized construction and much lower relative overhead of lake steamers, will almost certainly retain for them their present predominance in the grain trade, as also in the internal iron ore and coal traffic. There is however, a further point, which appears to have been overlooked in recent discussions of the subject, but which, in my opinion, in common with several other students of the Project, constitutes the deciding factor of mutual advantage to both Montreal and the Lake ports, including your Queen City. It concerns the movement and chartering of tramp vessels. These, as you know, are not tied to any definite route, and have the advantage over liners of a much lower relative overhead cost. Expert opinion pretty well agrees that a large proportion of this group of ocean vessels may economically operate to interior Lake Ports. This does not imply any necessary loss to Montreal as an entrepôt or transhipment point. On the other hand, because of the peculiar exigencies of the Charter market, its importance should be greatly enhanced. The explanation is not far to seek. New York, at the present time, enjoys the strong competitive advantage of being the best tramp or charter market on this continent, not so much because of its more strategic location as an entrepôt, but because vessels calling there with cargoes from

Europe or South America, etc., are able to reckon on a great variety of possible charterings not only for strictly New York traffic, but from a great array of other ports scattered along the arms of the angle, of which New York is the apex. The risk of returning empty or light is thus reduced to a minimum, and the rates for equivalent distances are materially lower than tramp rates from Montreal—a difference which is in no way explained by higher insurance charges on the St. Lawrence, or even by the limitations of the navigation season. It is because Montreal has no such group of alternative ocean ports dependent upon it, Quebec being merely an outport for Montreal, and Halifax and St. John being too far distant to be classed as dependent. The construction of a 25 foot waterway with very considerable reduction in lockage delays, will, however, change the whole complexion of Montreal's adverse position as a charter market. A group of Canadian and American ports, including Toronto, with a potentially larger volume of traffic than New York's dependencies will now become tributary to Montreal's charter market. Ocean rates for bulk commodities moving in either direction across the Atlantic to and from Montreal or the Great Lakes ports should then approximate those from New York, because again the risk of returning light is reduced to a minimum. When I made a statement before the Montreal Canadian Club a few weeks ago that a reduction in the costs of moving grain from our Western Provinces via the St. Lawrence to its ultimate market in Europe, of from 3 to 9 cents a bushel, I was severely criticised by some of the "die-hard" opponents of the project, on the grounds that my maximum of 9 cents was inconceivable. They pointed out that the minimum rate from Fort William to Montreal is even now as low as 10 cents a bushel during certain months of the year. After carefully checking up my calculations, however, and allowing for the condition of tramp rates just mentioned, in addition to the advantages of the Barnes' proposal, if carried out, and including the improvements contemplated on the St. Lawrence below Montreal to reduce insurance charges, I still consider a 9 cent reduction per bushel as a conservative maximum. As for the minimum it is likewise ultra-conservative, for not only does Dr. Ritter, backed by Mr. Hoover, stake his reputation on 3 cents as a minimum reduction on Lake traffic alone, but even a member of the National Advisory Committee has endorsed this estimate of the minimum potential reduction in a recent Senate speech. Their reasons for making this estimate I take to be too well known to all of you for me to repeat them here, but the real importance of these conclusions, if we take 6 cents as a conservative average reduction in wheat rates, is in the resultant enlargement of the western grain area, tributary to the St. Lawrence, and in the proportion of this new traffic which will take the Montreal rather than the Buffalo-New York route. Taking the average rate per wheat-bushel-mile on the Prairie and halving the distance which the six cent rate would cover, with the present competitive outlet via Vancouver and the potential outlet via Hudson Bay, and making due allowance for the location and direction of railway lines, and the seasonal fluctuations in water rates, I have computed an increment of slightly over 28,000 square miles, or approximately 15,000,000 acres of agricultural land to the area served by the St. Lawrence route. Without going any further into details of the probable increase in grain traffic from this new region, as well as the undoubted increase of production in the region already served as a result of the six cent stimulus, all things being equal, I think it is unnecessary to say any more on this point in order to demonstrate the material growth of entrepôt grain traffic through Montreal and Lake ports which may be reasonably anticipated if the Deep-Waterway scheme is realized. Nor does this include the vast hinterland of twenty-two states of the American Union, which, according to Dr. Ritter will thus become tributary for international trade to the St. Lawrence Route.

This brings us naturally to the international question. That which concerns the respective spheres of provincial and federal control is before the Supreme Court, and therefore is not a suitable subject for discussion. The question of United States influence or control is,however, one of vital national interest and importance, and cannot be overlooked. I fail to appreciate the validity of the Hon. Dr. Reid's warning regarding injury to navigation by joint control, or even American control of works located in their territory at Barnhart Island in the International Section of the river. The navigation aspects of the scheme are from the American viewpoint so insistent and paramount, effecting as they do some 40,000,000 of their people on their own estimate, that I fail to see how a mere million horse-power, or at the most, 1¼ million, distributed even at the maximum radius of 300 miles among a population of only 20,000,000 can ever endanger our vital navigation interests in the Lower St. Lawrence. Even admitting that self-interest, unscrupulous self-interest, will ultimately determine the policy of a larger nation to one having only a twelfth of its population, yet self-interest in this case would force any American government to protect the navigation feature of the project, quite apart from treaty commitments past, present or future. The danger lies not in this million odd horse power, but in two quite different directions. We have far more to fear from the massed insistence of superior numbers that the whole waterway from Lake Ontario to the Sea, be under United States jurisdiction, if this crude materialism which has been attributed to her in some quarters, *is* the real basis of American foreign policy. If such is the case then we can expect nothing better by procrastination than merely postponing for a few years the evil day when the big fish shall swallow the little one, when the rising tide of economic pressure for the water way from the marooned states of the middle-west, will break the dykes of our national self-sufficiency, and take things into their own hands. I have merely carried to its ridiculous conclusion the motive which several of our countrymen have ascribed to our republican neighbours. Such a process of thought in international relations is not only harmful, but is not in accordance with the facts. It is libellous to consider the few William Hale Thompsons as typical of the intelligent and honorable majority of American citizens. They may be pastmasters at driving hard bargains when they hold the trump cards, as they did in 1909 when they skilfully worked into the Boundary Waters Treaty a clause excluding previous diversions from the application of the Treaty, and persuaded our negotiators and statesmen to sign away their rights to the 8,600 cubic feet per second diversion of the Chicago Sanitary District, which we now know was actually being diverted before the treaty was signed. I do not imply that our legal position is hopeless for recovery of damages from the diversion, but it is certainly not as promising as it would have been if the treaty had not been signed. We in Canada, descendents of a race that for a hundred odd years have lived at peace with our neighbours, may accuse them of being shrewd, but not of unscrupulous treatment, and not of forcible encroachments upon our territorial or administrative entity. The analogies of Panama and Nicaragua are quite irrelevant. There was no question of Columbian enterprise undertaking the gigantic task which Geothals & Gorgas so brilliantly achieved for the United States, and with American capital. The chaotic condition of Nicaragua, where foreign lives and property were at the mercy of political marauders, can hardly be cited as an illustration of the conscienceless imperialism of the American government and people.

In the St. Lawrence Deep Waterway question the game is to be played between us as in the past, according to Hoyle, except that we hold the trumps. We can dictate the terms, for the simple reason that we have no vast marooned hinterland insisting upon its completion. The United States has! What terms shall we then insist upon? That the United States pay all the navigation costs including our expenditure on the new Welland Canal? It is not unconceivable that such terms would be accepted, because on their own calculations it would be well worth it. Nevertheless I think this would be a short-sighted policy. Whatever honourable intentions they may have for respecting our sovereignity, there would always remain with the American people a sense of proprietorship in this vital artery of Canadian communication. Certainly the fairest division of costs, and in this I include both the Welland and the expense of deepening and improving the upper channels and canals, would be on the basis of benefits to be received, since no tolls are to be charged. There is little doubt that the navigation benefits to the United States would be at least double in volume to those of Canada. Ritter considers their relative gain as considerably higher. I therefore throw out this suggestion as a solution of both the international bogey and an unfair burden upon the Canadian taxpayer:

> That Canada pay a share of navigation costs slightly more than the agreed benefit ratio would impose upon her, such extra amount being stipulated in the projected treaty as a definite and permanent quit-claim on the part of the United States for any control or jurisdiction over power or navigation works or routes lying wholly within Canadian territory.

Such a sacred declaration between two friendly nations, could hardly be open to abuse by a people that has always prided itself on the rigid observance of the sanctity of international promises.

We now come to the second danger which arises out of the objections numbers (7) and (8), namely,

> Our ability or inability to absorb the power, and the strong influences which will undoubtedly be brought to bear, to export that 4,000,000 of Canadian horse-power on the St. Lawrence to drive the wheels of industry in the New England and New York States.

I know that there are many outstanding economists in Canada who consider the export of power as of no more consequence than that of wheat or paper, who would even be so true to their training in the Manchester School, as to say that a power embargo would be contrary to the Law of Comparative costs and therefore injurious, to the best interests of Canada. They point out that in that great American semi-circle of 300 miles reside over 20,000,000 persons, that this region supplies a large portion of our imports and takes 12% of our exports, that its shortage of power has driven many industries, notably cotton-mills, into the South Atlantic States, that a wealthy, industrious neighbouring region supplied with our power would be a distinct asset to and market for Canada. Very plausible this sounds in theory, but it does not fit the practical teaching of experience, nor the peculiarities of this elusive product, electricity. It is now very generally recognised that electricity once exported is irrevocably lost—that it is such a basic and all-pervasive factor in modern industrial and social life, that cessation of supply would be considered as almost a "casus belli". Toronto experienced darkened streets during many critical nights of the Great War, because the American government rebuffed Canada's request for a return of exported power for her needy munition plants, with the terse statement that such a cessation of power export would be "considered as an unfriendly act."

What then are the prospects of our utilizing this power in Canada. They are bright indeed. In fact present trends, even if interpreted conservatively, would indicate the urgent necessity of nearly all of this enormous increment of electricity by the time the whole St. Lawrence Improvement Project is completed. The safest and soundest estimates which I have had from reliable and disinterested engineers is that 12 years would be required for its full construction. We can expect among the slow moving wheels of government and international negotiation, at least five years to elapse before work can actually be commenced. So in this 17 year period what are the prospects of our electrical requirements, and how can they best be satisfied.

At the present time Canada's installation of Hydro Electric energy has reached almost 5,000,000 horse power, or about one-eight of our potential total. Much that remains can only be developed at prohibitive cost, much more is permanently out of range for utilization in our heavily industrialized portions of Ontario and Quebec. It is the rate of our development and utilization which has shown the most astounding strides during recent years,—quite out of proportion to our increase in population. Since 1921 our hydro-electric development has risen in a geometric curve, doubling at the rate of once every six years, while consumption in kilowatt hours has increased even more rapidly (or once in 5 years) in other words, the load factor of our power industry has improved steadily. If this rate were to continue, even allowing for other projected developments, Central Canada would require all of its share in St. Lawrence Power by 1937 or 1938 at the latest, or 7 to 8 years before it could all be available. I hesitate to accept such a calculation however. I consider that this meteoric post-war expansion in the Hydro Electric industry as a reaction from the artifically restricted and retarded development resulting from the Great War, and the reconstruction period which followed it. For this reason I do not anticipate much more than a maintenance for several decades to come of our arithmetic increment of the past six years. But even this would bring us to an urgent requirement of St. Lawrence Power by 1945 or 16, or 17 to 18 years hence.

I am informed authoritatively that your Ontario Hydro Commission would be able and willing to market its whole equity in the International Section of the St. Lawrence, within this province, as soon as it is available. Quebec Province, as you know, is already granting a charter to a private syndicate for the partial development of the central section of the St. Lawrence, under a plan which may be readily combined with the whole projected scheme when necessary. A substantial part of the 300,000 h.p. which will be available there is already spoken for, in connection with extensive electro-chemical and metallurgical industries to be located in the close vicinity of the site, and which will ultimately require up to 3–4 million horse-power. While present conditions do not warrant wide-spread railway electrification, yet the Canadian National railways have completed plans for a gigantic electrified terminal in Montreal to replace the archaic Bonaventure, except for local freight.

Traffic density on Canadian railways which has increased 30% during the past seven years is rapidly approaching the level where complete electrification of trunk lines will be economically desirable, if present average fuel prices are not reduced. Within the narrow radius of 100 miles from the main Canadian power sites live 2,000,000 Canadians including both our federal capital and our commercial metropolis (apologies due to Toronto!) The latter's population is increasing at a rate which, if maintained, would, including suburbs, reach 2,000,000 by 1945. Within the wider transmission radius of 300 miles live over half the population of Canada, or approximately 5,000,000 people, including your own city, and your would-be rival, Hamilton.

Such industrial development as I have indicated will of necessity draw large numbers of people into the area. There are indications that regional drain to supply such population requirements in new industrial areas has about reached its limit. Mr. R. H. Coats, Dominion Statistician, expressed this interesting opinion to me the other day in Ottawa, and added that such requirements as those I have indicated must certainly be met by immigration. It should go a long way towards solving this knotty problem at least for a few decades to come. I cannot agree with Senator MacDougald's estimate of an increment of population amounting to 7,700,000, directly resulting from the projected development of the St. Lawrence Power. This figure after careful examination appears over-optimistic, but even my own estimate of a 2,000,000 increase attributable to this development, a figure based upon the average of several previous developments, and with the elimination of several possibilities of error, indicates the potentially great economic benefit to Canada not only from improved transportation and communication, but from the vast electrical treasure which the St. Lawrence holds, and which there is little likelihood of our parting with.

For sixty years by girdling railways and protective tariffs we have sought to transform a natural North and South community of economic intercourse, into an East and West chain of solidly-welded links. Some have called it an artificial chain, but it is nevertheless a sturdy one. I foresee in this improved waterway from Fort William to the Sea, a means of crystalizing in a natural and advantageous form the East and West outlook which is the basis of our Nation's history, an ideal of which our grandfathers dreamed, for which our fathers laboured, and which we in the fullness of time shall realize.

The thanks of the meeting were cordially tendered to Mr. Goforth.

THE INFLUENCE OF MUSIC ON THE COMMUNITY

AN ADDRESS BY MR. EDWARD BRANSCOMBE, OF WESTMINSTER ABBEY

28th March 1928.

[Mr. Branscombe was accompanied by his choir of men and boys, The Westminster Glee Singers, and before his address Mr. Edmund Jones (Magistrate) presented each boy of the choir with a box of candy.]

Mr. Hugh Eayrs occupied the chair and introduced the speaker, who was received with applause and said: I see I am to talk to you on a rather fearsome subject: "What English music means to the Britisher." You know the Britisher is a very strange animal, especially in his native lair. He has for many centuries cultivated the habit of suppressing his feelings, and so you really cannot say what anything means to him until you know him very well. So as the subject is a little bit difficult and not very interesting, with your permission I am going to talk on something rather different, more connected with music. I want to speak on the Influence of Music on the Community. It is never a very easy matter to speak to a gathering such as this on a technical subject. Music, you will all understand, is a science, with a technique attached to it, and if you try to discuss it in a way that is understandable to everybody, you very often tell the musically inclined man many things that he knows better than you, and sometimes you run the risk also of sailing over the heads of the non-musical. But if I talk to you in plain language about the influence of music on the community, I think you will find it more interesting than the subject that had been selected for me.

I suppose there are very few of us that are not aware in some degree or other of what music can do. You all know how music can lift you up to a sense of great elation or enthusiasm, how it can rouse within all of us very high emotions and desires, how it can depress us, and how it can affect every one of the numerous emotions which are part of the outfit of humanity. Let us take these, starting from the top, with what I shall call the spiritual aspect. We all know the enormous power that music has in religious observances and ceremonies; we all know the uplifting effect of music, particularly when it is in any sense connected with Divine service, and in that higher aspect of music it has gained the name of The Divine Art. But there is something more from the spiritual side in the value of music, because it is the most potent former of character that the world knows. Perhaps that may seem strange. There is a phrase—I term it a catch-phrase—that human nature is unchanging. It is a phrase that trips very glibly off the tongue when anybody wishes to excuse himself or herself for something not quite desirable. "It is my nature, I was born so, and nothing can alter it." Surely that is all incorrect; surely everybody knows as we go on in life how one's character does change, and I want to show you what an enormously valuable factor music is in the changing of the undesirable side of our characters and our natures. You may take one very simple fact. You know in this present day, we are all suffering even at this late stage from the devastating emotional and mental effects of the war, and in that department music has been of enormous potency in rectifying that very distressing condition of affairs. We are suffering, an enormous number of us, from irritability, from nervous trouble of all types, and there is nothing more powerful in the world than a particular form of music for remedying that condition. It is quite possible for anybody to test that. We who are constantly engaged in doing this work night after night, know beyond peradventure what those effects are. We know some of us go into our work in anything but a happy and right condition of mind, and yet we have not been at that work for very many minutes before the whole attitude is changed towards things;

there is more cheerfulness, more composure, and so on. I shall give you a little later the scientific explanation of what happens in this case.

Let us take the question of the bearing of music on health. What is ill health? Now I am going to give you a rather unusual explanation; I cannot say that it is one that everyone can accept, we are not all of the same bent of mind, but my investigations and studies in this matter have been carried out from rather an unusual angle. I look at all these things—I hope no one will smile—I look at these things all from the occult standpoint, and that will give you the cue to some rather cryptic sayings that may fall from me in the course of my little talk with you. We are accustomed to think that the automatic actions of the body are carried on without any guiding hand. We are accustomed to think that the digestive organism, the circulation of the blood, the beating of the heart, and all these things, just happen by chance. My friends, nothing happens by chance. There is a purpose in everything, and there is a reason for everything, and what I want is this slight discussion to impress upon you is this idea that there is a definite body of entities, of one type or another, call it what you will, who are looking after those particular functions of the human body. To give a simple illustration: You know if you cut your finger and you keep the dirt out of that cut, that will heal by itself. The doctors have a phrase for the process, but it is only a phrase. What power is it that causes that healing, that brings that healing into effect? What power is it that draws the ends of those severed pieces of skin together? It is not chance. Something is doing it. Those little entities or beings, whatever you like to term them, that govern all these functions of the body, immediately start to work on that damage, and do their utmost to repair it, and if you let it alone, if it is an injury of a more or less minor nature, the thing will to all intents and purposes heal itself, as we all know. That does not *happen.* Picture for a moment this little army of entities carrying out all those functions, doing all the repair work of the body, and so on, and then think that if you give them right conditions in which to work they can carry out their functions fifty times better than if you give them wrong conditions. Ill health is merely these entities or beings working in a condition of disharmony. You can take a simple and concrete instance. You sit down to a meal when you are in a condition of anger, and what do you get? A case of acute indigestion. Your wise course is to let your meal wait till your emotional body is at rest. If not, you are asking this large body of workers to carry out certain duties connected with your digestive functions, and you are giving them the worst possible conditions under which to work. This was seen enormously in the war, and the influence of music was seen to be of such extraordinary value. As many of you well know, time and time again when a regiment or a body of men has been on the march and well-nigh exhausted, and as close to passing out into the next world as human beings could be and still keep moving what has been done? The band has started to play, and the spirits of those men revived, and an entirely different attitude exists amongst them, and the explanation of that is not a very difficult one. When you get the human body in that stage, the mind is stirred by the impact of military music, by rhythm, or more particularly, should we say, the oft-repeated accent has a steadying effect, it restores all this disharmony and enables a man to take control once more of that part of his organism which previously was gradually slipping beyond his control.

You know there are many instances of the application of this healing power of music. There was a case of an American physician who took over to Europe one of his patients who was suffering from a very very distressing form of melancholia, with suicidal tendencies. This physician took him into some of the European capitals, and he found himself in Vienna, and for the want of something better to do frequented restaurants where there was a band, and he found after one or two visits that his patient showed a little more interest in things and was momentarily a little better. He linked the two things up and carried that thing on systematically, and took him through a course of light opera, and then a course of grand opera, and it resulted in a total and complete cure. In our country, one of our kings, George III, was similarly troubled, and he knew of the power of music, and when the melancholia was coming on he would always order the presence of his musicians, and restore himself to a better condition.

In my younger days, when my friend Mr. Donald Reid was a little boy and used to sing duets with me, we had a rather interesting experiment. Westminster Hospital is right opposite the Abbey, and Canon Harper knew of these beneficent influences of music and he got a little party of singers and instrumentalists to go to the bedsides of the patients to help them in any way he could. But most unfortunately, there is no systematic knowledge of the subject, and it is not possible at the present moment to choose your music to produce the desired results. So the experiment was not wholly and entirely successful.

Shall we turn to the value of music in business life? You might say, "Surely it has no part there". It has a very great part. In our country quite recently, one of our great department stores started community singing at half past eight in the morning for their employees. You may say, "What does that do?" It starts the whole emotional outfit in a harmonious and pleasant way. It brings all these people together and commences the day in this very delightful fashion. You know, it is only a truism that how you begin the day is very often how you go on and how you end it. In America, that land of strange happenings, they had another application of music. In connection with University work it has long been known that if you put a person under an examination, it is not by any means certain that you are going to get a clear idea of what his capabilities are. The nerves play such havoc with us. At one of the universities they conceived the idea of getting all the students into a room, and playing the organ to them for half an hour. The results were extraordinary as compared with the students who had not that influence of music. In business life, what music does is this, it helps a man towards balance, towards equipoise and equability. The rhythm of music will do that. I will not say it makes him clearer headed, but it certainly gives him the possibility of handling his brain in a better manner than the man who has only a slight portion of that composure and balance which are of such great importance in business life. The rhythm of music is a very wonderful thing.

Shall we pass to the question of the education of the young? I think the idea is dying out, though it has been a very very slow death, that music and the cultivation of it is the right only of people who have plenty of leisure and desire some pleasant and refined amusement. I really think the time is coming when people are beginning to regard music as it should be regarded, as an integral part of the education and up-bringing of every child. (Applause.) There are some movements in that direction now, and they mostly come from the younger parts of the Empire. In New Zealand, a country where I have spent a considerable amount of time, they are most advanced. They have recently brought out to that country four men from home who undertake the supervision of vocal music in the public schools, and they do it by teaching the teachers to sing. It is manifestly impossible, of course, to go around to all the schools and do that work yourself, but what they are doing is to train the teachers, and their ability to pass their examinations is regulated by their ability to take a class of children and teach them vocally. I wonder whether you can realize the enormous importance of that. It has such an enormous importance on the question of speech. If you do not speak decently, you cannot sing decently. Now I am getting on a rather touchy subject. I was warned of this before I stood up, but I always think it is best to face facts. People say in this country, "Why can't we produce boys that sing as your boys?" Well, the thing is simple. You have got them here by the thousand; our boys are not different from any other boys but what is different is the purity of their English.

There is no objection to a dialect except on the score of its unmusicality. To the musical ear certain dialects are a little bit hurtful; you do not get the musical sounds in certain dialects. Let me tell you the two worst in the world—the Cockney at home, the gentlemen who say "I sye." Even if you are not musical you can see that sound is not very elegant, it is not very pleasant to a musical ear. The other one—I hope there are none of our cousins from the United States here—(Laughter)—I will tell you very quietly so that they will not hear, it is the Yankee dialect. There is nothing more troublesome in the world to make good singers out of than a Cockney and a Yankee. (Laughter.) Insofar as you strike a country where the English is as pure as you can get it, so you will find the material for your boy singers is there just as it is in the Old Country. (Applause.) If you want, as you should want, in this beautiful land to encourage boy singing—and there is nothing more charming in the whole world to me, and I have been occupied in it for more years than I care to remember—that is the only way you can do it. If your children speak badly they must sing badly. What are you doing in singing? It is merely elongated, drawn-out speech; that is all. People have an idea that we have two sets of apparatus, one to speak with and one to sing with; nothing of the sort. Purity of English is the mark to aim at if you want good singing. Many years ago in the days of Queen Elizabeth it was the custom for every educated man to sing and to be able to read music. Those two things do not always run together. There is a story of a country gentleman who came to London and presented himself at Court, and when the dinner was over music books were handed around, and everybody in that room sang. And what did they sing? Very very difficult music. They sang the madrigals, and this gentleman was not able to take his part, "And so," said he, "I must forsooth betake myself to a learned and scholarly musician, that I may learn." I sometimes think we would be better off if we could do that way; if instead of my standing up to talk, we all sat down to sing. In the

Old Country there is a reminiscence of that in the Madrigal Society. Everybody sings; you have no right there unless you sing. How you sing does not matter, it is the fact that you are embarking on singing as a pastime for your own particular pleasure, that counts. When dinner is done, music books are handed around, and to show you the interesting connection with those old times, the books are so printed that my vis-a-vis can sing his part and I sing mine from the same book. That is going on in the city of London to this day.

Shakespeare says "The man that hath no music in his soul is fit for strategems and spoils, let no man trust him." Shakespeare said many wise things, but that is perhaps the wisest. I really think the refining influences of music are so enormous that that would really be an absolutely truthful statement.

You may say to me, "How does singing compare with the learning of an instrument?" All the difference in the world. In singing you are speaking on your own instrument, and if there be, as I hold there is, an improvement of the emotions, the substituting of the right emotion for the undesirable one, which leads in the end to a change and alteration in a man's character, he gets that in the nearest possible way by singing, because playing upon his own instrument makes him his own mentor and his own teacher. Some people will say, "I cannot sing, I have no voice." Manifestly if a man had no voice he could not talk. Would you be surprised to know that singing is almost as natural an accomplishment of human beings as it is of birds? Everybody can sign. I do not say that everybody ought to. (Laughter.)

There is another rather important point. You know every eye forms its own standard of beauty in the form of art. Now what are you going to do with your young people, bearing in mind that there is that standard of what it likes and what it does not like? What are you going to do for the children of the community in these circumstances? There is only one wise thing, my friends, give them kindergarten music and lift them up gradually. I mention this because I have been the recipient of some rather uncomplimentary remarks, not on this tour but on others. I met an eminent man in Montreal who said, "I do not like the look of your programs, I see you have got this and that; we are a bit above that in Montreal." I said, "Yes, I suppose you are; how many of you?" (Laughter.) He said, "Quite a number." Well, you know a good number is two per cent of the population. Now I ask you in all common sense what should I do, coming to a country like this with programs that appeal to two per cent of the population? Sometimes the percentage is a bit greater. In this city, the first musical city of the Dominion, we expect to find it greater, and we sing something a little higher than the standard, but what would be the use of me coming into this country—not an inexpensive matter—and giving work which only two per cent of the community can take pleasure in? Am I doing music any service? I consider I am doing music a great disservice unless I am giving something that is understandable by the community, and pleasurable to them to listen to. (Applause.) I spoke to that gentlemen in that strain and then I said, "You know what a highbrow is?" He said "Yes, and I also know what a lowbrow is." I said, "I go right between the two." He said "That is a wise course." But you know the highbrow is a fanatic, just as the lowbrow. One leans to that which is common and undesirable, and the other toward that which is above everybody's head except his own.

If we are going to make any use of what music can do for us, there is a great necessity for ear training in our schools. That is being attended to in many places very much more than it was in my young days. As an illustration of what can be done for another of the senses: If you go to India, to Cashmere where they make the beautiful shawls, and you take a ball of wool that to you looks red, and give it to the Cashmere weavers, they will separate that into fifteen or more distinct shades, every one of which represents a different color to them. That is the result of centuries of training of the eye, and that is the reason why rugs and other things that come from that country have that inimitable softness and beauty. Similarly with the question of ear training.

Another enormous factor in our musical life is community singing. Community singing is carried on in most parts of the Empire, but I am not at all sure that the value of community singing is properly appreciated or understood. Most people say we come together for a delightful singsong and we let ourselves go. All very good, emotionally and so on, but my idea of community singing is that it is very desirable to cultivate a particular emotion—shall we say courage, power, strength. Very well, you have in this community singing a song which gives a great opportunity and you ask your singers to put out every fragment of power and strength and energy that they can into that verse, and you try that verse half a dozen times. What have you done? You have perceptibly raised the capacity for courage and power and strength in every one of your singers. (Applause.) That can be done through the whole range of emotions.

You get a concrete illustration of this working with the emotions if you take an ordinary instance. If a man comes to you and talks in a condition of great anger, you may be perfectly amiably disposed towards him, but what happens? After a little while you gradually begin to boil inside and you end up by being as angry as he. Similarly you know the man we call the wet blanket. You are in happy intercourse and a man comes in who bears that unfortunate cognomen, and little by little your spirits go down and down and down. Were you a clarivoyant, which I am not, but a good many people are, you could see emanating from that man these destructive vibrations, and they are impinging on your body and calling out from you a similar rate and type of vibration. The wet blanket man cannot help it; it is his normal mode of thought, it is emanating from him, he is exuding depression the whole time. That is a question of vibrations. Let me give you a few concrete illustrations to show how these things work with purely physical and visible things. Not many years ago in England there was a band playing near a ruined castle, and at a certain part of the piece they came to what we call a unison note, that is, every instrument playing the same note; and down went the walls of this ruin. What is the explanation of that? All matter, whether it is visible or invisible, is in a condition of vibration, steel and iron and rocks, and everything is in a condition of vibration, only so slow that the eye cannot see it. And when it vibrates, it is giving off a note; whether we can hear it or not has no bearing on the matter. The rate of vibration of that wall produced a certain note which was answered by the band with such force that the fabric of the wall was destroyed.

There is another instance that is spoken of in connection with Caruso, taking a tumbler and sounding it to get its note, and if you sing into the glass the corresponding note you shatter it. You have struck the rate of vibration of the glass, and the result follows. There was a case recently of a traveling musician going along the road with his fiddle under his arm. He came across some laborers constructing a bridge, and as they were taking their dinner he asked alms of them. He got nothing and he said, "Very well, I will play your bridge down." He went and got the note of the bridge and then began to fiddle on that one note, and in the course of time the bridge began to rock. The workmen called him off. In a concert hall he said, "Did I but know your note I could play you down." You get the same idea in a body of men breaking step when they march over a bridge. It is the reiteration of the vibration that makes it unsafe for those men to keep in step.

You know we sometimes talk of reading between the lines. You get a letter from a man, couched in manifestly polite language, and you say to yourself, I do not like the feel of that; I think I can read between the lines. Do you know what has happened; that man has written to you in a state of anger, he has forced himself to write politely, but those vibrations of anger coming out of his body come out of his hand and impinge themselves on the paper, and when the letter is opened those vibrations of anger come out and assail you. That is the origin of the expression, reading between the lines.

In the domain of music you may take two great pianists, and ask them to play you an identical piece of music, and they may get totally different emotional and mental results. What do you think has happened there? It is the personality of the pianist, which of course counts in every instance, which is making itself felt through that seemingly dead matter of the instrument. That force of the man which is reaching you and affecting you, is passing out of the man through the finger tips, through the ivory of the keys, through the hammers and strings, and reaching you in that extraordinary way. That can be done by anybody and proves the enormous value we should attach to personality or temperament in individuals. You get the finished exposition of this power to express through a musical instrument on the violin, where the man's fingers are in direct contact with the string, or in a still finer way when he plays on the instrument we call the French horn.

Recently in America an author of considerable note wrote these words about a convention of conductors of symphony in the United States: "Nine-tenths of the American people will scarcely hear of it, and not one in ten thousand would be incommoded if they all disappeared, but if all the railway signalmen, or the milkmen, or the janitors, disappeared, the superb edifice erected by the Pilgrim Fathers would be smashed to ruin." There you get the superficial and erroneous view of the way music helps the community, treating it merely as a superficialist, as a pleasant amusement, and ignoring altogether the higher and lasting effects. The present position of music in the world is a very very difficult subject to discuss. I am not going to attempt to do it, but I do want to speak to you a little about that which should interest you, the position of jazz. There is a great deal of discussion going on in the world today among musicians in particular as to why jazz should exist. For those of us whose enduring love it is to follow music as a livelihood, there is nothing too bad for us to say about jazz, but I do want to say a kind and gentle word for the poor thing, and to show you that there was a reason once. I told you that after the war everybody knows the awfully jangled condition of the nerves and the whole emotional outfit. There was only one thing to remedy that, and that was this jazz music. The essence of jazz is the eternal reiteration of a certain accent. Rhythm is not concerned; it is accent. The eternal hitting of a note. That helped the world, it restored it, it straightened out all this tangle of emotions, and helped things. But now-a-days it has all gone wrong, it has all run riot; the whole thing now, in my humble opinion, should be suppressed by law. (Laughter and applause.) What I think we fail to understand, not only in music but in everything else in the world, is that there is an evolutionary law in progress, and that there is nothing that comes into the world that is not necessary at a particular time. I see some of my friends of the Church; I am sure they will not misunderstand me when I say that there are things of very great evil in every department of life, which yet are necessary. There are all sorts of false systems of theology and so on, but they tend in the end to separate the chaff from the wheat, and they give us something to think about, and to argue about, until ultimately we do spend a certain amount of time in the consideration of things which would otherwise not cross our paths. In the direction of music you see this evolutionary law working in a very very remarkable way. I am going to give you this only as a hypothesis; far be it from me to be in any sense dogmatic, but I hold that there is very strong evidence of this in the domain of music at the present day. You know all great musical composers are seers, they give us the unspoken thought of the people. You see the evidences; let me give you three. In Germany before the war what did you hear? Strident cacophony. In the music of Strauss and people of that type which Germany had at that time, we had this music, which depicts militancy. You all know the way Germany went into the war, and you can find that reflected in the music just at that time. Go to Russia; the whole of Russian music is permeated by a never-ceasing strain of melancholy, and you all know the troubles the Russian Empire went through. Take our own country, what do you find at the present day? The folk tunes that we use in our concerts are being utilized not only as they are, but in major compositions; they are using them in string quartets and in symphonies, and so on. What does that argue? It foreshadows a peaceful, happier time for our country, the music foreshadowing what is coming in the very near future. (Applause.)

The modernist movement in music is a difficult one to understand because these modernists, these great men, are so very much greater than any of us; manifestly it must be so. They are on a level with the divine teachers, of the teachers of art capable of high composition, because they are engaged in uplifting the human race. Manifestly if a person is sent into the race to do that particular thing, he must be miles and miles above us. Take poetry and painting. Was the poetry of Browning understood in his day? Were the paintings of Turner understood in his day? And is the music of modern composers understood in our day? Most assuredly not. I want to tell you why the music is so strange and causing so much discussion. There is, in my estimation, the working out of this evolutionary law, carrying us to a greater point of detail in respect to music. The western musical scale is divided into a certain number of notes and half notes, and so on. In other countries they have a smaller differentiation, giving an infinity of results more than we have, and I believe all this modern music is approaching that time, and they are trying to get to it under the limitations of the modern keyboard. Without being technical, that is about all I should say, but the modernist has his place in music.

Not long ago they were cutting up Piccadilly in London; a workman was busily engaged with a compressed air drill, breaking up the concrete, and making a terrific noise. An old lady went up to him and said, "Well, my man, I don't know what instrument you are playing, and I hate this modern music, but here is a copper for you." (Laughter.)

We are credited with being of a little use in the welding of the Empire together. We bind you to ourselves a little bit tighter by the influence of music that so many of you know and so many of you love, and we are glad to sing anywhere, whether it be a chapel, as we call it, or a church or a theatre or a hall. I do love to sing to a large number of people, and I always find my most satisfactory results, from the standpoint of enthusiasm and interest, come from those people who frequent the vaudeville houses. Somebody once defined part singing by saying "part is singing and part is not." I think our singing is mostly the real thing, as far as we can make it so, and I want to offer you all our very very best thanks for the great honor and courtesy you have shown us in inviting us here. Now we are going to sing you something that is historical and of very great interest. It is termed a ballad and is that type of music which was sung in the 16th century, and danced by the people at one and the same time. I do not think many of us could do that now-a-days.

The Glee Singers then rendered "Now is the Month of May," written by Thomas Morley in 1590.

The thanks of the Club were tendered by Dr. Fricker.

ENERGY AND COMMON SENSE IN EDUCATION AND EMPIRE

AN ADDRESS BY MR. ARTHUR ROWNTREE

5th April, 1928

MR. FENNELL, the President of the Club, introduced the speaker, who addressed the meeting as follows: I wish to say a few words about energy and common sense in education and empire, and I think if we look through many of the crises of British history we shall find that those two qualities have been conspicuous in the British people. I feel that I speak with great deference here—my friend on my right will probably tell me that I am incorrect in some of my statements—I think that when Magna Charta was signed, common sense and energy were the conspicuous qualities of the people then. And if we come down to the troublous times of the 17th century, those two qualities were conspicuous again. I do not know what Wolfe's men would have been without the energy and common sense that were shown in 1759. It was the lack of them that caused trouble a few years later on the other side of the St. Lawrence. And when we look through the 19th century history we find those two qualities constantly cropping up. I need hardly refer you to the Great War in this century but I will just in passing refer to that astonishing event in England known as the Great Strike, when the common sense and energy of the English people were the marvel of the whole of the civilized world. (Applause.)

We are told sometimes that we are a weird people, we have not got the brilliance or the culture of the French; we are men of action and we are dull. I am not sure that we need be altogether ashamed of dullness. There was a master in one of the English schools who had to send in his terminal reports to the Headmaster, on each boy in his form, and he wrote of one, "dull but steady; will make a good parent." (Laughter.) If we look back at the history of education in the Old Country for 100 years, we shall see many things that will astonish us at the present day. There will be some Oxford men present here today, I have no doubt; nevertheless this story is true. A hundred years ago an undergraduate presented himself at Oxford for his degree. He had to translate a few sentences from Livy, he had to explain the fifth proposition of the first book of Euclid, and he obtained his Arts degree. He proceeded to a fellowship, he became Warden of his college, doctor of divinity, and it was he who shortly afterwards wrote this sentence: "Righteousness will not come to the earth again until the writing, printing and publishing of books is prohibited by law." (Laughter.) In those days the law of natural selection had hardly worked in connection with games. At Eton hoops and battledores and tops held their place along with cricket and football, and there were astonishing things going on in some of those great public schools. I do not think Dickens was exaggerating when he wrote his account of the famous school of my own county of Yorkshire. There were mutinies not unusual in some of the big schools. George III used often to ask the boys at Eton when he met them, "Have you had a rebellion lately? Eh? Eh?" And was disappointed if there had not been one of recent date. (Laughter.) At Winchester there was a mutiny, I think in 1816; there had been several at the end of the previous century; there was a mutiny that was put down by a company of soldiers with fixed bayonets. I think the best record that I know was in 1797 when the Head master of Rugby had ordered the boys to refund a tradesman where they had done damage to his property. Their reply was to blow up the door of the Headmaster's study, to burn his books, along with a number of the school desks. He called in the police, the Riot Act was read, the boys retired to the island there, and the island was after a day or two taken by assault by a company of soldiers. I believe that the last of those mutinies took place at Marlboro in 1801. Common sense and energy in education? I think the common sense was absent and the energy was misplaced in the story of those boys. I believe that the improvement in education in the Old Country was largely due to Butler of Shrewsbury, Arnold of Rugby, and Thring of Buckingham, and I would like to add the name of an unknown man, Ford of Bootham, York, my own school, because he was so responsible for influencing the principals of English schools in regard to the employment of leisure time in schools. And of course these men brought a change in the school by introducing humaner methods, remembering that the boys were after all gentlemen and that they needed something to minister to other activities besides those that were at work during school time. Greater allowance was made for natural history work, archaeological work, music, art, carpentry, and a number of other things. It was that kind of thing that helped to bring about the better feeling in the schools.

May I say a few words about two characteristics of English education at the present time in some of the schools, and I can speak with most authority of the school that I know, but of course I am not suggesting that the common sense and energy that I am speaking about is confined to one particular school. The two things I want to emphasize are citizenship in school life, and the employment of leisure hours, and of course with citizenship I think of the citizenship of the great empire as well as the citizenship of our towns and our own country. We are accustomed to allow one form or about 25 or 30 to have an intensive course on citizenship during three or four weeks of the year, and we are able to find time for that. During that time they may be studying the government of the country, they may be studying the imperial relations among the Dominions, they may be studying the housing question, or the coal problem. They will go and attend one of the meetings of the City Council, and not always hear anything profitable from the City Fathers. (Laughter.) They will study the work of the Guardians of the Public, and then during the whole of the year, two evenings a week some boys from a poor club in the east end of the city will come to the school for some of the upper boys to teach them gymnastics and swimming and cricket. We can get hold of the gang spirit, the common sense and energy, and the boys like to be able to help those who have not had the same opportunities. And then at the beginning of August twelve or fifteen of them, with one or two of the masters, will take fifty or sixty of these lads out to camp, and they will work and play together there for the time. The Duke of York has done the same kind of thing for the whole country, and year after year he invites two hundred of our public school boys to meet with three hundred factory lads and they live for a week or ten days under canvas together, helping with the running of the camp, and enjoying their games together. (Applause.) Last year he extended it to five hundred, and he asked an additional fifty of each, who had been there the year before, to join them as alumni for that particular camp. And you will forgive my pride if I mention that on the last day, when four hundred of them started out for the cross-country run, it was one of my two representatives who came in first from that race. (Applause.)

You may consider that I am trespassing from my path of common sense and energy, if I go back to talk about the Romans; but you cannot live in our City of York without being impressed at every step by the teaching of history. Only last summer we were celebrating the 1300th birthday of the great Minster of York, and three or four years ago we appointed a local committee, and I was very glad to serve on that committee, to dig with energy and common sense in some parts of the city where we knew there was Roman stuff to be found. The result is that we can now show you the Roman walls. What you see in York at the present day is of course the medieval wall, in many places on top of the Roman wall, but we have now been able to show five different walls. When the Roman first came to York in 71 A.D., he threw up a clay mound. We have dug down and found that clay mound, with some of his wooden palisades still adhering to the clay. No doubt Roman

York was overrun by the barbarians, some of our ancestors, I suppose, a few years later; and the first stone wall was built, and we have found this stone wall, twenty feet below the surface of the ground, still with the coping stones in place for a distance of a few yards, and five feet from the top a two-foot sentry walk with the cobbles on for the sentries to walk along. The barbarians came again. York was overrun, and a third wall similar to the second has been found. We have also found a fourth, and then on the south side of the city, about the year 320, they built another wall with what we called the multangular tower, to guard against the incoming peoples on the river side of the city, again our ancestors, the English-speaking people, who were beginning to come up the river in those days.

We cannot have these things in the City of York without them influencing our education, consciously or unconsciously. A boy from my school three years ago was a field naturalist, a very keen geologist, and he was working one half-holiday fifteen miles away from York at the top of a quarry, hoping to find certain fossils that he was looking for. Instead of that he kept coming on bits of Roman pottery. He took home some pockets full and took some other boys out with him the next time. Within three or four weeks they had taken sackloads of Roman pottery from this place, some three inches in size, some eight or ten inches. Evidently it was not an accident that they were there. We thought it full of interest, and we applied to the Yorkshire Archaeological Society and to the landowner, the Earl of Carlyle, and we got leave to have this piece of the field marked off for our boys to go on with their excavations. They worked for months and found more and more of these pieces of pottery. The Roman pottery is so well known and so well catalogued that the experts will talk about any piece as A 15 and B 25 and so on, and they were able to piece a number of these fragments together so that we got nearly complete bowls. We thought it must have been somewhere there that the Romans made pottery, and the archaeologists had wondered for years where the pottery had been made. It looked as though there was some likely clay near, and we went on digging trenches and cross trenches, until last July we suddenly came down to three kilns where the pottery was actually made, and when we got down to the holes and flues they were still black with the charcoal that had been used in connection with those kilns.

I want to suggest that things of that kind are extraordinarily useful in education, and in the education of boys who are going out as colonists when their school-days are over. They develop an initiative and a widening of horizon that they do not get from their ordinary school work. The energy and common sense of a boy can be used in ways of that kind.

Now I do not want to suggest that energy and common sense will make an empire, or are sufficient by themselves for imperial bonds. I think that with our energy and common sense we are all of us guardians of a great spiritual city. I am thinking of the world of books. I noticed the other day that an enterprising journal had asked some of our leading men in England, some of them literary men, what three books had most influenced them in connection with their life work. One replied "The Bible, Bernard Shaw, and Kipling." Another replied, "Shakespeare, Dante, and Homer." A third, somewhat of a highbrow, said, "I cannot distinguish any three books or 30 books or 300 books, that have specially influenced me." And Bernard Shaw sent a postcard: "Who told you that any book had influenced me?" (Laughter.) But when we come to think of it, surely one of the greatest glories of the world is the English tongue, and Shakespeare, and Bunyan, and Swift, and Burns, I count amongst the greatest builders of empire who have lived at all. (Applause.) It matters not where we live; they are ours, they belong to us as much in one part of the world as in any other. We are to celebrate in England this year the 300th birthday of John Bunyan. I was looking through one of his immortal works the other day and I was struck with his energy and common sense. It is in the second part, which of course is not so good as the first part, he brings his pilgrims to one particular place, a valley where there are fat and fertile lands, and they wish to live there forever and enjoy the fruits of that beautiful country. They would like to be sure that that was the nearest way to the Father's House, so that they might no more be troubled by the mountains and the hills. And then Bunyan says, "But the way is the way, and there is an end." And quite lately the author of the Fireside Saga has told the English-speaking people that he considers the great things in life are, to do our job well, to be brotherly, to seek health, and to ensue beauty. (Applause.) It is in thoughts of that kind, it seems to me, that we get one of the great imperial bonds. We cannot run an empire on energy and common sense alone. We must add to these qualities, knowledge, and particularly the results of scientific enquiries in the 19th and 20th centuries. I have thought that I was an unsatisfactory person to speak about empire; I know something about England and Scotland and Ireland, and I have had the privilege of being Gen. Smuts' guest in South Africa for a couple of years, and then four days in Canada. I was struck out there in South Africa with the determined way in which those men were going to make a success by using all the scientific knowledge that they could get hold of. It was a question of getting the fruit to the English markets in thoroughly good condition. They sent two of their best botanists over to England to examine the cold storage. For six or eight weeks in England they went each week to the boat when it landed on Monday morning, they saw the fruit on the boat, they saw the fruit in Covent Garden, and they reported to their government on any changes that ought to be made. I am sure that you in this country, with your great farms out in the west, are linking your work to the latest teaching of science. Knowledge we must add.

And then may I say one word about aspiration, aspiration for the best mental and spiritual gifts that we can attain to. I noticed that our Prime Minister in England last Saturday was calling upon the grim earnest of English youth, that is, the commonsense and energy of English youth, so to carry on the torch that the kingdoms of the world may in future be flooded with the light which we today can see only in our dreams. (Applause.) It is this kind of thing, aspiration, that must be added to the knowledge which comes as we go on in life.

It has been a very real pleasure to me to meet with members of the Canadian fellowship, who form one fellowship with the rest of us who are in the British Empire. We all start out on the same pilgrim's way, whether our home is Great Britain or Ireland or one of the great Dominions, and we start on that pilgrim way endowed with something of energy and common sense. As we go along that pilgrim way I am sure we add to our equipment, knowledge and aspiration. Each maintains his own individuality, but we are all united in aim and destination, and I believe that there are no stronger bonds in the world than bonds of kinship and aspiration to hold us together. (Applause.)

The thanks of the club were tendered to the speaker by Mr. W. D. Gregory.

WORLD POLITICS OF CANADA AND THE EMPIRE

An Address by DR. H. F. MUNRO, Superintendent of Education for Nova Scotia

12th April, 1928

President Fennell introduced the speaker, who had kindly consented, at short notice, to take the place of Sir George Foster, who could not be present on account of illness. Dr. Munro said: World politics may not appear to be so much in the public eye as they were eight years ago, but none the less they are exceedingly important, and more than ever important to Canada, because if there is one thing that we are all agreed upon it is that Canada is a nation. Of course constitutional lawyers may differ as to the interpretation of the expression "nation", as to its significance; but we all know that Canada today is mistress in her own house; she has practically all the autonomy she needs within the Commonwealth; and being a nation means that she has been admitted into what is called the family of nations. Coming into that family she faces a certain situation, and that situation is what I call world politics. Canada is not only a nation, but she is internationalized, and today, politically speaking she has to bear her share of international responsibility. It is therefore very important for her to know the situation that she faces.

It is not my purpose to describe the aspect of the international field at the moment. But there are certain permanent features internationally that always obtain; they obtained for hundreds of years, and will obtain in the future, that we as Canadians, as a member of the family of nations, have to recognize.

The study of world politics is an immensely fascinating one. It is a study that has not yet found a great place in our schools or universities, but it will become more and more so in Canada as time goes on. In the United States, and to some extent in Britain, a great deal has been done in the study of international affairs, which is a kind of science; there is an attempt to find the fundamental principles that underlie the life of nations. The more we study international relations, the further back we go, the more convinced we become that there are certain fundamental underlying principles that govern the life of nations, and that change very little, if at all, with the centuries. It is a few of these principles that I wish to discuss today.

These are principles that are not foreign to us; they are not something remote; they touch us; they affect us; they affect our lives and fortunes; they have so affected us in the past, and will affect us in the future. It is therefore desirable that we as a member of the family of nations should be acquainted with them, to know what are these tendencies that are operating about us all the time that have pushed us into war in the past and may push us further into war in the future, unless we learn the valuable lessons from history which possibly we are failing to learn.

Perhaps the outstanding feature of the family of nations as at present constituted is the principle of nationality, or nationalism if you like that term better. Our present state system, our modern family of nations, is based on the system of nationalities. That is so prevalent, so universal, that we take it for granted; but it is not necessary, and is not inherent in the nature of things that we have all these nationalities; and it is conceivable that some may have changed to a different value. If, 2,000 years ago, the Roman Empire had only made a certain political invention, it is quite possible that the present state system as we have it could never have evolved. If the Roman Empire had invented what Great Britain invented many centuries later, namely, representative government, it is conceivable that the Roman Empire would have persisted as a political entity down to our time. Now it is certain that one great benefit would have followed from that; we would have had merely one world state, and war would have been eliminated. In the western world, at the time of the birth of Christ, 2000 years ago, for a brief time there was universal peace, and I am not sure that there was ever such a moment since; but I think if the Roman Empire had continued to exist on a basis of representative government, if they had a certain instinct and genius to have made that invention, the world would have profited. That however is not the way we have evolved.

In the suburb of Boston, at a certain place, there is a bronze tablet with this inscription: "Paul Revere would have passed this house on the night of his famous ride if he had taken the turn to the right," (Laughter.) Now, mankind, I feel sure, would have avoided a great many complications, and especially would have avoided a great flood of war, if we had evolved differently.

The state system is with us, this system of nationalities or, as I should term them, nation-states: that is the system we have to take into account as a member of it, as a member of the family of nations. Now, the state system, as such, proceeds in a rather unsatisfactory way. For the last four or five hundred years there has been no international organization as such. Each nation-state is jealous of its sovereignty. We are living in what political philosophers say is a state of nature. If a Frenchman and a Dutchman, a Briton and an Austrian were to find themselves on an uninhabited island unpossessed by any state they would be, legally speaking, in a state of nature. That is to say, there would be no system of law to govern them, no sovereignty; each would be a law unto himself. Now, that is precisely the condition of modern states. There is no daysman, no supreme judge, no sovereign; each of the nation-states is sovereign, a law unto itself.

What then governs us in our relations with one another? Up to the present, a haphazard system of diplomacy; that is all. I am leaving aside for the moment the whole question of the League of Nations, but up to the time when the League of Nations was set up some nine years ago, international relations between the nation-states depended on diplomacy. Well, you know how that worked out. We usually plodded along for about a century; then came to some world war; there was one three hundred years ago; there was another one 200 years ago; there was another 100 years ago, in Napoleon's time, and there was one in our time. They seemed to come every century, and in between were little wars, with certain arrangements of diplomacy, certain alliances, etc., that carried on the life of the family of nations from one year to another. Diplomacy produces great wars, and we usually have great peace congresses to settle the affairs of the world on a permanent basis. If you read the preamble of the treaty of Vienna or Utrecht you will find that what was there contemplated was not an immediate settlement, but a settlement for all time; but that settlement never held. It reminds one of the story that was told of Mr. Barnum, who knew human nature very thoroughly. He used to make a specialty of happy families; in a cage he would have a lion and a tiger, a gazelle and a lamb, all lying down together. Some skeptic who doubted this arrangement asked Mr. Barnum if it were genuine, and he replied, "Well, in the main it is but I presume that the lamb has to be renewed every little while." (Laughter.) So with our great international settlements prior to the League of Nations. For a while—for a century or half a century—we get along very well, then some formula is produced, and the whole thing has to be fought over again. In between, the diplomats develop a system of diplomacy which, on the whole, works very well. I am not one of those who consider that the work of diplomacy is futile, and a menace to peace; on the other hand, diplomacy is the great buffer between states, and for every question that diplomats fail to settle, they settle ninety-nine in a very satisfactory way.

As you know, the great art in diplomacy is to find a compromise or, as they now speak of it, to find a formula. Of course the parties have to concede something, but in the main the finding of the formula very often helps us out. There is a good story told about a darkie parson who was very indignant at the way his congregation were stealing chickens; so he admonished them one morning about it, and became very personal, and he said, "At this very moment I see before me twelve chicken thieves including Deacon Johnson." During the week Deacon Johnson got rather hot under the collar, and held a series of diplomatic conferences with the parson, and parson agreed to take back what he had said. So on the next Sunday morning he said he had done injustice to Deacon Johnson in saying that he had seen before him twelve chicken thieves including Deacon Johnson, and he added, "I wish to retract that statement, and say that I see before me eleven chicken thieves, not including Deacon Johnson." (Laughter.)

Well, you see that is the way diplomacy works. It works out a formula which pleases everybody, and the thing goes on as long as no great supreme world interests are involved; but there comes a time in the international system when the question becomes too great for the diplomats, and no formula in the world can meet it, and war prevails because there is no other way to settle it.

Now, that is what I am concerned with pointing out at the moment, that an international organization like an international Supreme Court, or whatever you like to call it, is the only way to settle international disputes. War is not immoral; it is rather unmoral, or amoral, as the philosphers say. Our problem is to get another means of settling international disputes, but you cannot get it by branding war as wholly immoral, because that is the only way in the past that disputes of great moment could be settled. You remember the old phrase, that war is the last argument of monarchs; but it is equally true that it is the last argument of peoples or states, failing an international system; and that is the whole distinction of the League of Nations, that it provides an alternative way of settling international disputes. War has the precedents of thousands of years, and it will continue to be the way of settling international disputes unless we make another way. You cannot change the thing by denouncing war; we must get something better, and the League of Nations does give something better. (Applause.) It offers settlement by arbitration or judicial settlement or compromise or conference,—anything but war. But until we recognize that we have something that is substantially better than war, we shall have war.

I have passed over these points very rapidly. Coming back to the family of nations, it has certain machinery, —congresses, conferences, diplomatic machinery—but there is one fundamental aspect of the family of nations that I wish to emphasize, because it is the whole explanation of the last 400 or 500 years of war. It has affected us in Canada, and it will affect us as long as our particular family of nations exists, and that is what is called the operation of the balance of power. That is rather an abstruse phrase to the layman, but if you consider it a moment it is the most natural thing in the world.

You have the state system; many states competing for power; that is the position in the world to-day. States are organized to compete for power, for privilege, for industrial supremacy, for economic opportunity, for all other elements that enter into power. But the power in the world is fixed. The amount of water is fixed; the amount of resources is fixed; so that inevitably the competition between nations produces clash and rivalry. Furthermore, each nation-state has dictated to it by nature the policy it follows. For instance for centuries France has followed what is called the doctrine of natural limits. If France had to deal only with nature, with geography, France would have had her border on the Pyrenees and on the Alps, as she now has, and the history of France for centuries has been to get her natural frontiers. Russia, on the other hand, had her foreign policy dictated by nature. She had to get to the sea, with the result that before the great break in western Europe she gradually moved toward the sea, and finally reached the Pacific. Nature has dictated the policy of Britain. To Britain there are just two elements that are necessary in her foreign policy. One is the control of the seas—sea power; the second is the control of the countries immediately opposite her shores—Belgium and Holland.

Now, that being so, the family of nations competing among themselves for power, each state having a policy that is more or less natural, based on the necessities of the case, what happens? In the past you find that this struggle for power usually results in the alignment of nations into two camps. Perhaps the best instance —one that will serve as an illustration for us in our time—is what happened before the great war. France and Germany, hereditary rivals of centuries gathered around them alliances; certain states came to France; others came to Germany. The result was that each grew more powerful. Then there came a time when they became about equal in power. Something must break. War broke, and we had our great war.

For hundreds of years in Europe that has been the situation—France against Germany, with Great Britain off to one side holding the balance of power. The balance of power is perfectly natural. You hear some dreamers, persons who are not versed in war, inveighing against the balance of power; but the balance of power is impersonal, it is essential, the only thing that can give states their environments. We do not want world empire; we throw that out of our system; and we do not want it made possible for any state to start out to build a world empire. We fought Louis XIV; we fought Napoleon; we fought Germany; and we will fight the next one too to make world empire impossible. But the only way to fight them in the past, and up to the present, has been by forming a counter alliance to the aspiring power. That is what we did with Germany; that is why Britain went in with France and Russia. She did not like those countries particularly; I venture to think we might have found more congeniality with the Germans; but France was thrown, willy-nilly, into the circle with England and Russia, effected the Alliance, and war ensued.

In Canada we have been affected by the Seven Years war, the Napoleonic war, and the Great War. What is more, a nation like the United States, that thinks she is outside the balance of power, has been drawn into every war since her beginning. She had to enter the Napoleonic war in 1812, and she had to enter the Great War, and she has been sitting up backwards and thinking she has to do nothing in that concrete sense, but she will be in the next Great War, and so will we.

That is why I urge the study of foreign policy upon you. If you are to be a nation, if you want to rejoice with the family of nations, you must bear the duty and responsibility, (Hear, hear.) and one responsibility is to inform yourselves of the international situation and see from the past where you are going to line up in the future.

Incidentally I have in my outline mentioned that great fundamental principle that the United States sponsored, what is called the Monroe Doctrine. That doctrine is a plea on the part of the United States to say "Hands off" to Europe, and the rest of the world of course. It was Europe at first, but now it is the rest of the world. The Americans declare that the American continents, north and south, are to be considered closed for any further colonization or exploitation and there must be no importation of the European political system, no family compacts, and so on in American affairs. So far, the United States has managed to make a success of that, but in spite of her Monroe Doctrine she had to participate in the last Great War.

I want to point out that we Canadians are interested in the Monroe Doctrine, too, and we are acting on that, although we may not think so, confidently. Why is it that Australia is so interested in a naval programme and anxious to have a naval establishment and we in Canada are not? Did you ever think of that? The fundamental reason, the subconscious reason, the reason we do not formulate to ourselves, perhaps, but the one which we say to ourselves is, that as far as danger to the American continent is concerned, the United States will take care of us. That is the Monroe Doctrine. So in that sense we are, or ought to be, interested in the Monroe Doctrine.

If, conceivably, the north part of this continent, which is Canada, were by a great disturbance of nature put out in the Pacific, 3,000 or 5,000 miles from the Pacific coast, we would develop a naval policy very quickly, for the very same reason that Australia and New Zealand have a naval policy; but at present we do not think of it—whether rightly or not I am not saying; whether it is proper for us to do so, I am not pretending to say—but the real reason, I think, from the point of view of world politics is that we feel that we are American in that sense and in accord with the United States.

There are one or two other points of world politics that I will merely allude to. One is sea-power. The mere mention of a naval policy leads naturally to that. If you read history aright, if you take the long view of history, if you read it in 500-year doses, you will find that the great world decisions have been made on the sea. Sea-power is world power. The man who perhaps taught that best was Admiral Mahan, of the American navy, who wrote many works on sea-power. Now, sea-power is of vital importance, of course, to us British—the British Commonwealth. The great victories that have made the Empire, from the Spanish Armada down, have been won on the sea; and sea-power still remains the deciding factor in world war. I think we will all agree today that in the last analysis that it was the last strangle-hold that Britain had on Germany through the navy that starved Germany out.

This leads me to the next fundamental. In the past the great battles on the sea, the great struggle at sea, has been for the Atlantic. The Atlantic was the centre of the great world battles that were on sea, the great naval battles; but in the efflux of time the scene has shifted. The Atlantic is bare; now we are ushered into the Pacific. The great arena for the conflict of world politics in the future will be on the Pacific ocean.

More than half the human race live on the shores or near the shores of the Pacific. Count them; China 400,000,000; Japan, 65,000,000; India, 350,000,000; the Philippines, Canada, the United States, South America, Australia and New Zealand—to say nothing of the islands of the Pacific—more than half of the human race; more than half the economic resources; and what is more important, the great open spaces we have are all on the Pacific; and that is the rub—Canada, Australia, South America, the United States, New Zealand.

Now, if the operations of nature would be allowed to work we know what would happen. The yellow races would occupy those open spaces. They are the nations that need the open spaces; but here they are; we have got them nailed down, with notices up—"No Trespassers". There is the whole crux of the coming great world conflict. We have to settle that. We have, some way, to persuade the oriental peoples to obey the conditions. Some modus vivendi must be arrived at. Is it going to be war? Apparently it is, unless we devise means of settling without war.

As you all know, we, at least those who are interested in international affairs and are serious-minded, are all giving some attention to this great problem of war and disarmament. We have set up the League of Nations, but I need not tell you that the League of Nations is not set up to abolish war as such. There are a great many people who believe that that is the object of the League of Nations—to settle international disputes as they arise. Well, that is part of it, but the great principle that underlies the League of Nations is not the abolition of war as such, but it is international co-operation. (Hear, hear, and applause.)

Now, line up all those principles that I have laid down—the principle of nationality, the principles of foreign policy, the principle of the balance of power, and the Monroe Doctrine, and sea-power, and the mystery of the Pacific, and all the other fundamentals. Study them as Canadians, and as citizens of the world. Canada has already done something to contribute to the stock of political ideas. Canada has possibly developed a principle that may be the principle that will finally unify the League of Nations; because, after all, what is the British Empire? Not unitary states—states that are centralized like France, or federal states like the United States. It is what we call the Dominion type of government, first set out to the world in Canada. The Dominion type of government simply shows how a people can have complete autonomy and yet remain within the all-inclusive interest. It is a synthesis of different ideas that normally were thought to be in conflict, but we have reconciled them, in a high sense, in Confederation. It was worked out here successfully and imitated in Australia and South Africa and the Irish Free State. The British Empire may be defined as a League of Nations; and what has worked well in our Empire may work in the greater League of Nations of the world. It is the realization of autonomy with general interest, and that is Canada's most characteristic contribution to political development up to the present moment. (Applause.)

Hon. N. W. Rowell, on behalf of the Club, voiced appreciation to the speaker for his address.

OUR RESPONSIBILITY TO THE ENGLISH SPEAKING THEATRE

AN ADDRESS BY CLAYTON HAMILTON, ESQ.,

19th April, 1928

PRESIDENT FENNELL occupied the Chair and introduced the speaker. MR. HAMILTON spoke as follows: When you attend a performance in the theatre I assume that you look at the stage and focus your attention on the actors, and that, of course, is as it should be. But when I go to the theatre nowadays I often sit far forward in the auditorium and turn my back quite rudely on the stage and focus my attention on the audience; because for those of us who are active in the theatre as playwrights or directors or actors or producers, the drama which is enacted in the auditorium is often more momentous and frequently more exciting than the drama which is enacted on the stage. We know, those of us who are active in the theatre, that those people seated out in front, whoever they may be, constitute our partners in the theatre business and our collaborators in the creation of dramatic art. We can do nothing without their collaboration, and without their assistance, and therefore it is very necessary that we should learn to know them, to find out how they think and how they feel, and in what respects their sense of humor differs from our own. It is obvious, of course, that the public is a necessary partner in the business of the theatre. It is indeed the most important of all the partners, because it is the only partner which furnishes the capital, on which alone the business of the theatre can subsist. It is only a little less obvious that the public constitutes a necessary collaborator in the very creation of dramatic art.

A play is necessarily a co-operative undertaking. No dramatist can make a play, all alone by himself. First of all, he needs the collaboration of a company of actors and the assistance of various other artists of the theatre but even the combined efforts of all these artists, carried through to a final dress rehearsal, will not constitute a play without the further collaboration of a gathered audience. For to go back to fundamentals we must remember always that a play exists only during those moments while it is being acted on a stage before an audience. A play has no real existence before the first curtain rises. It ceases, temporarily at least, to have a real existence when the final curtain falls. That of course is the reason why plays can be studied thoroughly only in the theatre, why they cannot be studied in the classroom of the university or in the library. A play cannot be deposited in a library; all that can be deposited in a library is what I might call either the record of a play that has existed in the past, or the directions for making a play that may come into existence in the future. In order really to appreciate "The Merchant of Venice", it will not be sufficient to read the text at home; it will be absolutely necessary in the one available week to drive down to the Princess Theatre and see the performance of Mr. George Arliss. (Applause.) What we commonly call the text of "The Merchant of Venice" is not the play at all. From one point of view the text might be regarded as the report or record of a play that has existed in the past. This record tells us that while the play existed the actors spoke certain lines and performed certain business amidst certain stage surroundings. Here are the words that the actor playing Shylock spoke. Or to reverse the point of view, to look forward instead of backward, we might regard "The Merchant of Venice" as a series of directions for bringing a play into existence. The text tells us that if we will assemble certain actors amidst certain stage surroundings, if they will speak certain lines, and perform certain business, and if in so doing they succeed in calling forth the imaginative response from a gathered audience, a play will spring into existence, which we may call "The Merchant of Venice", and will continue to exist throughout the two or three hours' traffic of the stage. But the presence of a gathered audience is absolutely essential to the existence of the play; and not merely the passive presence of an audience, but the active participation of the audience in the proceedings of the theatre. So long as the people gathered in a theatre remain conscious of the fact that they are looking at something outside of themselves, listening to something outside of themselves, the play has not yet really begun to be. So long as they remain aware of physical division of the theatre into two parts, the world behind the footlights, where the actors are, and the world before the footlights where the spectators are, the play has not "come alive", as children say. A play springs into real existence only when, so to speak, it seems to pour itself over the footlights and begins to happen inside the minds and hearts of the people seated out in front. Or, to reverse the point of view, the people gathered in the auditorium seem in their imaginations to swarm up over the footlights, to enter the room which is exhibited on the stage—if the stage shows a room—so that they feel themselves in their imaginations to be among those present with the other actors, listening to a conversation in which conceivably at any moment they might take a personal part, participating in the passage of an action which presumably at any moment they themselves might interrupt. And it is only when this illusion is created in the theatre, that it is possible for the public to enjoy that vicarious experience of life, to furnish which is the one great function of the drama.

For why do people go to the theatre? They say quite frankly that they go to the theatre to enjoy themselves, and there could be no other reason. But that phrase must be taken literally. They go to the theatre to enjoy *themselves*, not to enjoy anybody else. Not to enjoy the emotions, or the simulated emotions of the actors, but to enjoy their own emotions as these may be stimulated by what they see and hear. Not to enjoy the ideas of the author, but to enjoy their own ideas, if any—(Laughter)—as their intelligence is galvanized into activity by the proceedings on the stage. And the degree of enjoyment which people may receive in the theatre is proportioned to the amount of the imaginative contribution which they themselves are permitted or required to furnish to the general collaboration. The reason why the experience of going to the theatre on the bankside three hundred years ago, and attending the early performances of the plays of Shakespeare was really more enjoyable than the average experience of attending the performance of an average play in the theatre of today, is that the public was permitted and required to make a larger and greater imaginative contribution. In the last act of "The Merchant of Venice" they listened to the lovely lines of Lorenzo and Jessica and then were required in their own imaginations to create the landscape and the atmosphere of Portia's gardens at Belmont with no assistance of scenery or other actual physical suggestion to the eye. They had more fun than we have in the theatre today, because they were doing more of the work. And even at the present time the most successful of our dramatists artistically, and also in most cases commercially, are those who subtly make it necessary for the public to do most of the work. A conspicuous example is Sir James Barrie, who never tries to tell people anything that they did not know before, but tries instead to remind them of what they have always known but seem to have forgotten. So that, as ideas and emotions are suggested to them, they regard them not as Barrie's, but their own; they say, "Oh yes, I have always known that," or, "That is something I felt when I was a boy, I remember now, so this is something I know all about." They feel as they sit there that they themselves are creating the play as it goes along. They have a better time because they are enjoying themselves than when they attend a performance of another type of dramatist who tries to make most of the play happen on the stage. Plays do not belong on the stage; they belong in the imaginations of the gathered spectators. Because the contribution of the audience is just as important as the contribution of the actors or the contribution of the dramatist, it is ovbious that the tone and taste of the drama in any country in any period must necessarily be attuned to the tone and taste of the available theatre-going public. The theatre never has belonged and never can belong to any manager or group of managers, to any dramatist or group of dramatists, to any actor or group of actors. The theatre always has belonged, and always will belong, to the theatre-going public, not to the entire public of a nation, but to that particular section of the general public which takes an active interest in the theatre, which chooses to participate in the affairs of the theatre, and which supports the theatre with its patronage.

In countries and in periods when it is socially customary for the very finest people to take an active interest in the theatre and support it with enthusiasm, the finest of dramatic art is rapidly developed. In other countries and in other periods where it becomes socially customary for the finest people for one reason or another to lose interest in the theatre, to desert the theatre, and when the theatre is handed over to the rabble, the art of the drama is very rapidly debased. If we review the entire history of the drama we shall notice that the dramatic art has climbed to greatness only in places and in periods when a great audience, an audience of extraordinary mental and imaginative equipment has been available for co-operation in its creation. Quite literally the world can never evolve a Shakespeare unless there is ready and waiting an audience capable of appreciating Shakespeare and enjoying Shakespeare, and of helping him to make his plays. The great tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, were written and produced in Athens at that one moment in the history of the human race when our human civilization climbed to the highest pinnacle which ever at any time it has attained. It was perfectly simple and natural for Sophocles and Euripides to write great plays, because they had a great audience to write for. Shakespeare's audience in the London of Elizabeth again, though comparatively crude, comparatively barbarian when set beside the audience of Athens and Pericles, was a very vivid-minded audience, very eager, very enthusiastic, tremendously imaginative. In ancient Rome the drama very rapidly declined. It became socially uncustomary for the patricians to patronize the theatre. They would not go. Tragedy ceased to be. A comic theatre was turned over to the rabble of Rome, and the very ablest of the Roman comic authors like Plautus, were obliged to compose their plays for an audience of morons, an audience furthermore very vulgar in taste, and that is the reason why the plays of Plautus are so excessively and childishly simple in their expositions, so unnecessarily obscene, so extravagantly profane; because he was writing for a vulgar audience that could be appealed to only in vulgar terms. Any type of entertainment that is designed to interest millions of stupid people, the ordinary motion picture of commerce at the present time, for example,—I am not speaking of the half dozen or dozen motion pictures sent forth every year that an adult person may sit through without screaming,—most of them made in Germany—but I am speaking of the ordinary motion picture of commerce, about 90% of the total output, the type of entertainment designed to appeal to millions and millions of people and that means millions and millions of stupid people, because when you get into the multi-millions you are dealing with stupid masses, and it requires an extraordinary command of all the attributes of taste to keep the type of entertainment sufficiently vulgar, so that millions and millions of essentially vulgar people will be able to respond to it. The vulgar mind can respond actively only to vulgar suggestions, just as the intelligent and cultivated and tasteful mind can respond actively only to suggestions within its range. You will see then that the present of our theatre, and the future of our theatre remain necessarily in the hands of those who may choose to constitute the theatre-going public.

In recent years in my country, which is adjacent to yours on the south—(Laughter)—I think we have had considerable cause for worry about the present and the future of our theatre when considered from this particular point of view. I am not worried about our dramatists;

I am not worried about our actors; I am not worried about our directors, because in all technical respects our theatre is in a very fine state at the present time. But in recent years, especially in my own city, in New York, and particularly in the decade that has elapsed since the interruption of the world war, it has seemed to many of us that there has been an appreciable decline in the quality of the theatre-going public. I may state the situation briefly in the formula that the best people seem more and more to have been drifting away from the theatre and the worst people seem more and more to flock to it. There are many difficulties in our country which do not obtain in your more civilized Dominion. (Laughter.) In the major cities of my country at the present time, New York, Chicago, and so on, we are pouring millions and millions of dollars every year, which under civilized circumstances would be put definitely into the treasury of the United States in the form of taxes, we are pouring all this money every year into thousands and thousands and thousands of illicit pockets, the pockets of members of the under world, who a few years ago had to work for a living and earned two or three thousand dollars a year, and who now do not have to work for a living at all, and make more than a hundred thousand a year. And this is occasioning a social revolution or overturning, taking people who formerly were at the bottom of the social circle and heaving them up on top. Meanwhile, college professors, preachers, doctors, lawyers, authors, actors, are not making any more money than they were before. And our new class of the newly enriched, an exceedingly numerous class in New York, Chicago, and other cities, on the principle of "Easy come, easy go" are flocking to the theatres with money in both hands. Vulgarians who twenty years ago never thought of attending the legitimate theatre, —they had places of entertainment of their own which had not yet been abolished—(Laughter)—now flock to the first-class theatres, with much more money in their pockets than anybody else, and have in recent seasons exercised a distinctly vulgarizing influence on theatre-going in New York. I have no desire to harp on the theatre of that particular city, except that in the United States it is a very unfortunate fact that the one great centre of producing activity in the commercial theatre happens to be New York.

I remember in the 1890's when I was a small boy going to the theatre in New York, there was a certain edifying flavor in the mere experience of theatre-going. As a boy I used to be taken to Daly's Theatre in the period when the leading man was John Drew, and the leading woman was Ada Rehan, and the leading author was William Shakespeare. (Applause.) I used to feel as I stepped into that temple of entertainment from the outside world that I was ascending from one level of civilization to a higher level, and as I looked about me in the auditorium I felt that it was a social privilege to be among those present in such a gathering, for the theatre was supported by the finest people in the city, and the finest people in the country. Now-a-days in New York on a casual evening—I am not speaking of the three or four bright particular occasions of the theatrical year—but any ordinary evening, if I drift into any ordinary theatre and look at the audience I feel distinctly that in entering the theatre from the outside world I have descended from the level of civilization on which I habitually live, descended to a lower level, and I no longer regard it as a social privilege to find myself among those present in the auditorium. Too frequently as I look about me it seems as if there has been a jail-break at Sing Sing. At other times it seems as if the entire house was filled with friends of the Schuberts, except that it does not seem possible that the Schuberts would have so many friends. (Laughter.) And as I linger in the lobby for purposes of investigation and listen to the people as they come out of the theatre—this is in New York—I am not interested in what they say but I am interested in the sounds they make in saying it. It is evident on any ordinary occasion that a large majority of the people gathered in the theatre speak English, if at all, in manners that are exceedingly broken, and must therefore hear the language with ears that shatter it to pieces. I have in past seasons written plays myself: —all of us have sinned—even Mr. Arliss is a temporarily retired playwright. (Laughter.) Now-a-days as I look at those people and listen to them, and say to myself, "If I ever write a play again, these are the people I must write for." The aspect is exceedingly discouraging. And consider how discouraging it must be for the actor, how discouraging it must be for the artist like Mr. Arliss to know that he is to speak the English language on a stage in New York before an audience half of which has no idea of what the English language sounds like, and no desire ever to learn. If he is playing in a modern piece in which the name of Thirty-Third Street is mentioned, he knows before he speaks that more than half the people in that audience call it Thoity-Thoid Street; and how is he to speak to them?

The situation is not so difficult in Canada, and yet I think that all of us must agree that, mainly of course as one of the devastating results of the war, the theatre-going public in London is not so conspicuously fine today as it was twenty-five years ago; it has broken up. Again in England at the present time, mainly for economic reasons, the finest people have tended more or less to desert the theatre. Other people not so fine, who in curious ways have got hold of money, which formerly was assigned by society to their betters, have begun going to the theatre for the first time, and they have tended to vulgarize it. Now it would be a very unfortunate thing if in our countries in the immediate future we should merely turn our theatre over to the vulgar mob, because they would very quickly make of it an entirely vulgar institution. Yet the only way in which it can be saved from being vulgarized is by some active undertaking of the intelligent, cultured classes, to hold it to its proper purposes. In most of the major cities of the United States, outside of New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia, the drama as an art, in recent seasons has almost ceased to be, whereas a generation ago good performances of good plays might be seen in American cities of half a million or more population nearly every week of the season. Now in such cities it is possible to see only one or two, or possibly three, first-class productions of first class plays in the course of the year. The theatre has been dying out. It has been for me a matter of amazement to notice that the people in general do not seem to care anything about it, do not seem to be at all perturbed. I have not studied the conditions in this city, but I dare say it is true at the present time that you see far fewer productions of first-class plays during the course of a season at the Alexandra and Princess theatres than you saw twenty years ago. There has been a very appreciable decline. Nobody does anything about it. I was talking yesterday afternoon in Toledo to a group of leaders of various women's clubs. In that city of Toledo the drama has almost ceased to be, yet nobody seems to be wearing a tragic expression on his face. I said to those women, the drama as a civilizing force must logically be taken as seriously as the church or the university. Perhaps in certain quarters of the United States the drama is more necessary than the university, because the university can dispense only education, and the drama at its best can dispense culture, which is far more needed. I did not attempt to compare the virtue of the university or the theatre with the church, because I did not want to start an argument—(Laughter)—but I said: Let us agree that all three are important institutions; now, I said, suppose you were told in Toledo that beginning with the first of next January the church would cease to be, as an institution in your city. After next January every church edifice would stand empty in your city forever; there would be no church services of any denomination whatsoever, no Christian gathering, all congregations, all churches would be abolished. I said, If that should be decreed, I think somebody would write a letter to a newspaper. (Laughter.) Or suppose that they were told that beginning next January the University of Toledo would close its doors, all public high schools would close their doors, there should be no more public education in the city; I think somebody would get up a meeting of protest or something. But they face a condition, I told them, whereby beginning the first of next January they will never again see a first-class production of a first-class play in their city of 300,000 people. And nobody gets up a mass meeting, nobody even writes a letter to the newspaper, nobody cares at all; they just let the theatre slip away and go by default, and they allow their children to grow up and go through high school and even college without ever having seen a first-class production of a first-class play, and for lack of other ways of spending their time these children in their teens flock to some gaudy exhibition on the cinematic screen of the story of the rich and vicious banker who endeavors vainly to seduce the poor but virtuous stenographer. (Laughter.)

If things go on as we have been letting them go recently in our country there will be no professional theatre in the next five years outside of New York, Philadelphia and Chicago. Nobody cares at all. If the people do not want any theatre they won't have any. If they do want a theatre, they will have it, because it has been the thesis of this conversation of mine that the destiny of the theatre is at all times controlled and commanded by the theatre-going public.

Now if the people want the theatre back, what can they do? Organize. Matthew Arnold said, away back in the 1870's, "The theatre is irresistible; organize the theatre." It is already sufficiently organized on the professional side of the footlights; we need not worry about that. It needs to be organized on the public side of the footlights. What ought to be done on this continent, in the United States and Canada, is for us in each of the important cities, Toronto for example, to organize a public, not necessarily large—a public of 5,000 people would be large enough for a city like Toronto—organize 5,000 people in a city of this size, 10,000 in larger cities, who would say "We are interested in the theatre, we wish to participate in the theatre, we desire to sustain the theatre at its highest and its best; we do constitute an audience; we are willing to attend; we desire to attend a first-class production of a first-class play once a month for eight months in the year, and to prove that we are sincere in this desire we will buy our tickets now at the outset of the season." Eight times a $3 ticket is $24; eight times a one dollar ticket is $8; if 5,000 people would pay their money into the treasury, buy their tickets for a season in advance, thereby organizing themselves in each city into a subscription audience, they could command the theatre, because they could see anything they wanted to see. If a circuit of twenty cities could be arranged, in each of which there was an organized subscription audience, the people themselves would say what they wanted to see, and would get it. If one month they wanted to see the Medea of Euripides acted and produced by Margaret Anglin, who is coming here two weeks from now playing a light comedy part, but she is a star of tragedy, Miss Anglin would rehearse the thing in a moment and bring it. If they said they wanted to see Mr. George Arliss perform some noble part, Iago for instance, Mr. Ames, who is a civilized manager, and Mr. Arliss, would be willing to produce the part and go on any circuit of twenty cities. I know Mr. Walter Hamlin, with whom I am associated, would take Cyrano de Bergerac out of storage and produce it. The civilized managers would be delighted to produce the finest plays with the finest actors and the finest caste and send them around to the cities of the country so that the theatre could be patronized once again by people of taste and cultivation, and not merely by a mob of people on a spree who have gone up to the metropolis to have a h—of a time. The people could do something for the theatre by organization. It has been done in the world of music, as Mr. Charlesworth thoroughly knows. Any city that wants to have a symphony orchestra gets it. A certain number of people get together and say: We want a symphony orchestra, we will buy tickets in advance, here is our money, and then the city has an orchestra. Cities that do not do that, do not have them. The art of the drama is just as fine an art as the art of music, and should be considered seriously by the public. Although the public takes seriously the art gallery and the concert hall, it never pays any serious attention to the theatre, and treats all forms of theatrical production as if they were equally unimportant. The most ordinary kind of vulgar show that is shovelled on in New York for the benefit of visitors from Squeedunk, Ohio, is classed the same as Shylock presented by Mr. Arliss. That is all so stupid. Nobody does anything about it. My main interest in travelling about and talking to people of various cities is merely to get them interested in the theatre as an institution, seriously interested. I do not want to tell them what to do about it; I want them to do the thinking. They are the audience and the audience is important in proportion as it does the thinking and becomes creative. (Applause.)

The thanks of the club was extended to the speaker by Mr. George Arliss.

WHAT IS TO BECOME OF CHINA?

AN ADDRESS BY RT. REV. W. C. WHITE, BISHOP OF HONAN

26th April, 1928

PRESIDENT FENNELL introduced the speaker, who was received with applause and spoke as follows: China is a big subject as you know, and probably the aspect of it that I want to take would require a good long time to exhaust, if you ever could exhaust it,—What is to become of China? That is the subject that is in people's minds today, and more and more as years have gone by, people have wondered what is to become of China. It is the great problem, it seems to me, of this world and the nations of this world.

Some thirty years ago, just after I went to China, Lord Charles Beresford wrote a book on The Break-up of China, and at that time people thought that China was going to break up, but she has not broken up yet. And then they began to suggest different measures to remedy the situation of China. One was the matter of annexation, and you know how the Powers began to lop off pieces of China. For instance, in the south France got Tongking and other parts, and in the north Germany got Kiau Chow; and Britain got Wei Hei Wei, and Japan got Formosa, and Korea in time; and even Italy and Belgium began to apply for parts of China. That was one method that they had in their minds from twenty to thirty years ago,—annexation. Then they found it could not be done, it was too big a problem, China was too great, and the jealousy among the powers more or less prevented that. Then another attack was made along the line of spheres of influence. France was to have her sphere in the south of China; Japan was to have her sphere in the north, that is, part of Manchuria, and also Formosa and Fukien. Britain was to have the Yangtse Valley as her sphere of influence.

Where did the United States come in? She had not annexed anything, she had no concessions, but she wanted to have a right to go into every part of China—(Laughter)—and so she propounded the theory of The Open Door, and that was backed up in time by Britain, and the suggestion of spheres of influence was stopped. Of course at the same time the Boxer trouble and, a little later on, the Russo-Japanese war all had an influence in stopping the suggestion of spheres of influence. And then came another suggestion, a suggestion that has been maintained up to the present, international intervention on the part of the Powers. That is, that the Powers join together and by international arrangement, govern China. They found that that was too big a thing. Then it was suggested that the Powers should do this through certain sections of the country, and then, again, that they should intervene through control of the institutions and organizations of China as, for instance, international control of railways, international control of land taxes, international control of the salt gabelle, which is more or less under international control; and of course the customs and the postal service. These three services have been under foreign control up to the present and, as a matter of fact, they are the three sheet anchors of China today from the point of view of finance to carry on the government, that is the Customs, the salt gabelle, and the postal service.

I may say in passing with regard to intervention that even this week suggestions have been made with regard to intervention in China, and I want to say here that the sending out of troops by Britain to protect her interests in Shanghai cannot be called intervention on the part of the Powers in China. Intervention is really interfering in part with the sovereignty of China, touching the sovereign rights of China. This matter of sending troops by Britain was not an interference in any way with the sovereign rights of China; it was simply to protect British nationals and it was one of the best things that Britain has ever done, certainly in the last few years. (Applause.) There are Chinese who a little over a year ago opposed sending troops to Shanghai, who today are praising Britain for that, and they recognize that Britain saved China from a tremendous affair. No one knows what would have happened it Britain had not had troops to protect Shanghai. Certainly Shanghai would have gone down in a welter of bloodshed. Britain saved the situation there; it was only to protect British property and the lives of British subjects but through that action she saved China from a catastrophe.

As we look back over the situation there is no doubt that the Powers have exploited China to a greater or less extent, and China has suffered all these indignities and insults, and seemed helpless; but they have all brought about the situation which has stirred China into new life and you have a situation there at the present time which is full of great promise. In my thirty-one or more years of residence in China, I do not think that China has ever appeared to me to be so full of hope as she is today. (Applause.) That may seem strange to you. The truth is, it required something of that kind to stir China into life, new life. You remember what Napoleon said about China: "China is a sleeping giant: let her sleep. When she wakes she will move the whole world." Now she is awakening and there is new life full of promise.

When we speak of the nationalist movement in China we out there speak of it as "The New Thought Tide," and that is what it is. It is a new spirit that is underneath this disturbed surface; the wind is blowing, as it were, across the surface and the spray of the waves is blowing in all directions. That is the disturbance you see on top; but underneath there is a set of the tide in one direction, and that is towards a new life, towards a reconstruction of China, and that is a hopeful situation. As we look back upon the years we see many things that have brought this about. It began, you might say, some eighty years ago by those first contacts between the different nations and China, contacts at the beginning of a commercial kind, nations wanting to trade with China, and then because of misunderstandings on both sides, conflicts occurred, and so there was a great deal of commercial aggression backed up by military force, dating from eighty years ago to recently. There have been other influences there, the contacts of western civilization with that old, more or less stagnant Oriental civilization. Both sides not quite understanding each other, there have been conflicts. Also western education. You remember how by the stroke of a pen the old system of education in China in 1905 was done away with, and a new system based upon our methods of education was adopted. That meant that instead of the old Chinese classics, they now had to study things that made them look ahead to the future. The old Chinese system of education was simply a knowledge of the classics, whose writers lived a couple of thousand years ago. And it was only that. Their idea of science, as you know, was practically nil, although in early days they showed that they were of an inventive genius and could produce the mariner's compass and could invent gunpowder. Block printing was in use in China hundreds of years before it was used in Europe. Even a thousand years ago they had a taxi system. It was Professor Giles, Professor of Chinese in Cambridge, who looking through the old books of a thousand years ago came across that idea, that some of the carts that used to travel across the plains of Honan had a system by which at every lee—that is one of the units of distance there, about a third of a mile—every lee a gong sounded, and every ten lee—another unit—the drum used to be struck. We have seen in Punch about the Scotsman having his first experience in a taxi; immediately the dial registered sixpence, he said "Bang goes saxpence." It was literally a bang in that taxi system of a thousand years ago. (Laughter.) So many things point to a capacity for invention but it became stagnant and, as you know, China has of late been probably the slowest country to take in things of today, modern things, things connected with modern machinery and modern science. She lived only in the past. Now she is beginning, by this change in education, to look out to the future, teaching not only to memorize the classics but to think out things. That is going to create a great situation there.

Besides western education, there has been the matter of Christianity. I want to mention that here because Christian missions in China have had a powerful influence in producing the situation in China today. It has been said to me that many have the idea that the bottom has dropped out of missions in China, that it has lost out. Anything but that. This situation in China, the evacuation of something like six thousand missionaries out of a total of 8,200 missionaries, is going to be one of the greatest things for the expansion of the church of Christ in China that I know of. It has put on the cause of missions twenty-five years. It has produced a situation that could never have been produced if it had not been for the evacuation of the missionaries. It has made the Chinese Christians and the Chinese Christian leaders take hold of their responsibility in the church, and when the missionaries go back after this, and a great many will not be required, the Chinese will only have those that they want, they will have a say after this. When missionaries go out after this, they will go out to assist the Chinese church that has come into being, that is now on its feet, and that has measured up during this last year in a wonderful way to this new situation. (Applause.) They will be assistants in the future, the missionaries will. The Chinese Church is now in the lead, and that, as you may understand is what we want. Just here, in passing, I may say in regard to our own little mission in Honan, it was eighteen years ago last month since we began our work there. At that time no work had been done, we had not a foot of land, we had nothing. Now we have a synod of the Church carrying on with its different boards and different committees, and just a few weeks ago that Synod elected its Chinese Assistant Bishop and this Assistant Bishop, I hope, will be consecrated to that high office when I return at the end of this summer. There is something I want to mention in regard to that which is in line with the idea I want to give you of China's capacity for continuance. The

Assistant Bishop's name is Jung. Now 2600 years ago one of the feudal states that included almost the whole of the province of Honan at that time, was the feudal state of Jung. That means that the Jung clan was the ruling clan in that state. The Assistant Bishop is a descendant from that ruling clan that ruled in that province 2600 years ago. Is there any country on the face of the globe where you would find anything like that, that the first Chinese Bishop in this province should be a descendant of the ruler of that very place 2600 years ago? (Applause.)

With regard to these contacts bringing about this awakening,—this aggression, commercial and military, these contacts, Christian, educational, and with western civilization—has developed a situation which is a critical one for China. You have been reading in the papers yesterday and today of this movement against the North. About sixteen years ago, the Chinese republic began through a revolutionary party under the leadership of Sun Yat Sen in the south of China. At that time they won, and they astonished themselves when the Manchus abdicated. At the same time in the north there was a strong reactionary party under Yuan Shi Kai. He had charge of the army of China, and the centre of government was there in Pekin. The people had not a chance to realize what their liberty from the Manchu yoke meant, and so there was for a time a deadlock; there was the southern party under the Sun Yat Sen, the provisional president, and the reactionary party in the north under Yuan Shi Kai. The Manchu house had abdicated, but there it was. Sun Yat Sen did a very fine thing, he gave up his position as provisional President in favor of Yuan Shi Kai, and Shi Kai became the first President. It happens in many places, but particularly in China, that men gather around the new President, and it was not long before they practically hoodwinked him. I had this from men in close touch with him at that time. One thing they did was to have papers published, only two or three issues a day, and they made clippings from this paper and brought them to

Yuan Shi Kai and said, "The people do not want a republic, they want to revert to a monarchy, a limited monarchy; they want you to be the emperor of China." Shi Kai said, "If this is the will of the people, as we see from the clippings of these newspapers"—he did not know it was this private issue—he said "we will do so," and you remember he was declared emperor. It all came out. Immediately the south under Sun Yat Sen organized once more and this time they were going to fight to a finish. That is what has been going on ever since then. These groups, particularly in the north, and the revolutionary party in the south, standing steadily for that one goal, to do away with the militarists and the reactionary parties, and reorganize China. They had no money or munitions. They went to the different powers. Britain said, "We cannot interfere." The United States said the same; other nations said the same, except Russia. Russia helped by advisors, military and political. Borodin was the chief military advisor. They helped with funds, helped with munitions, and contributed two things in which the Chinese were deficient, one was the matter of propaganda—they carried out a tremendous propaganda system throughout China—and the other was the matter of organization. Those two things strengthened the Nationalist party of the south, so that they were able to carry on, and are now today practically coming into the ascendency in the situation in China. In letters I have received from Chinese the last few weeks, and from our missionaries, writing from Honan, right there under Feng, the Christian general, have told very clearly that an advance against the north was anticipated. They were very confident. Even in the city where I lived, they were preparing to receive 20,000 wounded men; so they were preparing to do things on a big scale. They have already taken Tsinanfu and Pekin is almost within their grasp. As far as I can see now, it will mean the evacuation of Pekin before many days, and the occupation of Pekin by the southern government. That does not mean that Manchuria will be taken, perhaps, for many years, but they will control China proper, and having Pekin as the centre practically, China will be unified nominally, although it will take many, many years before conditions will be put right in China. That is as I see at the present time, and the one man that seems to be outstanding in all this welter over there, is the Christian General, Feng. So many questions have been asked about him on all sides; people say, "But he is a traitor, he has gone back on his colleagues." And that is true; as far as one can see he has gone back on his colleagues many a time. I have seen documents signed by Feng himself, with regard to munitions from Russia, one amounted to something like seven and a half million roubles and another was three and a half million. On those documents he declared that he would hold himself under the orders, practically of Russia, that he would pay back in any way and at any time that Russia should demand. That meant practically that he had sold himself to them. Now we know he has gone back upon Russia. That is something that unfortunately we see in regard to this man. You can only explain his christianity by a statement that Sir John Jordan made about him. He said, "He is an Old Testament Christian." (Laughter.) To my mind, that explains him.

Not very long ago Feng has sent messages to me, that is, he has sent his men to my men out there to pass on messages to me, and he has shown by those messages that he is going to do all that he can to straighten things out, with regard, for instance, to the losses that the missions have suffered. In our own case, for instance, some of our buildings have been looted and we have lost considerably. St. Paul's Hospital, given to us by St. Paul's Church, Toronto, has been looted more than once, but the extraordinary thing is that that is under Chinese management and that is the only hospital in the province that has been able to function through this year. Feng sends a message and says, "As soon as the situation has cleared up we will make good the losses you have suffered." Now since he is on the winning side we hope to see him make good. (Applause.)

Britain has of course suffered a good deal of criticism the last year or so, especially since 1925, over the trouble in Shanghai. But really Britain's diplomacy in regard to the East is wonderful. She seems to make mistakes and somehow she comes out on top after all. At the present time I would advise those who are interested in this matter to get a little book by Sir Frederick White; it is the revision of that little book prepared for the Institute of Pacific Relations that met in Honolulu last year; it was published last month, and is on China and the Foreign Powers. In that book Sir Frederick clearly shows the position of Britain in China up to date, and he says that after all Britain has come out on top, and she is now able to initiate movements there which will amount to a very great deal. We have for instance the boycott of British goods. We have lost a great deal of late but the memorandum that was given by the British Government in December, 1926, and the annex to that memorandum in January, 1927, are away ahead of anything that any other country has done, not excepting the United States. The other nations have not measured up to those most generous concessions that Britain is willing to make in regard to the revision of those so-called unequal treaties, and the restoring to China of those things which China considers belong to her sovereign rights, such for instance as extra-territoriality, consular jurisdiction, the control of the maritime customs, and matters of that kind. Britain has made her stand there, and it is really a splendid position, and the Chinese now recognize it. Before leaving China this time I had occasion in Pekin, and in Tientsin, and in Shanghai, to talk to men who are leaders in the government, some on one side and some on the other, and now they have nothing but praise for Britain. They put Britain first for two things, first British integrity, when Britain gives her word she stands by it; and the other is that British goods are first-class. A little over a year ago I said to a man, "Why do you want to criticize Britain in this regard?" "Well," he said, "we feel her goods are best and when she gives her word she stands by it, but if we can get Britain to agree to these things all the other Powers will follow, and that is why we are concentrating on Britain." He is a high diplomat and had a great deal of criticism in regard to the diplomacy of Britain in one particular thing I am not able to mention here but it was a very important matter, and I believe he is right. I believe some of the individuals have probably not been all that they ought to be, and they have been looking at it from one standpoint only, not trying to take a long view and to realize that to get Chinese good-will means a great thing for Britain in the long run.

To understand the China of the future you must understand the China of the past. Those of us who heard Dr. Davidson Black the other evening will remember how he told that human origins from the standpoint of zoogeography were to be found in Central Asia. If he went on from that he would tell you probably about the traces of early man found up in Mongolia of Paleolithic times, a little further down, in Shenshi, further traces, then down in Honan traces of Neolithic man, and how Dr. Andrews, realizing that there was a stream of migration probably from Central Asia, made investigations and found similar things, Neolithic traces, in the pottery and other remains, things very much like the pottery found in Shushan the capital of Persia, and many things in Mesopotamia. He would tell you how in regard to culture, you would find parallels between the culture of China and the culture of Egypt, the culture of Babylonia, and Assyria, and Greece and Rome and Persia, and when you take a bird's eye view of the whole situation, you realize that the first point that stands out clearly over the past history of China is her capacity for continuance. Greece and Rome and Persia and Egypt and these other countries rose to great heights in the matter of culture and civilization, but they have gone down; and yet China has carried on steadily, the only nation in the world that has done so. You do not find any break whatever. You might say that from Paleolithic times to the present, Chinese people have lived in China and carried on in China. In the 13th century the Mongols came in and acquired China, but they were there only a hundred years when they were absorbed by the Chinese. In the 16th century the Manchus came down and acquired China, and the Manchus in acquiring China made the Chinese wear the pigtail; it was a badge of their servitude. More than that, the Manchus established in every walled town a Manchu garrison, and they put those Manchu soldiers all over China to control China; and after 215 years what happened? The very same thing; they were simply absorbed, and Mongolia and Manchuria are a part of China, and the Mongolians and Manchurians are Chinese practically. No nation can conquer China; it is absolutely impossible. That is the first thing, their capacity for continuance.

The second point is their power of absorbing and making their own. I would like to speak a little about this. Take, for instance, Buddhism; it came there from India but the Buddhism of China is very unlike that of India it has taken on a Chinese color. The same in regard to Mohammedanism; the same with regard to Christianity. Christianity in China is not going to be our western kind, it is going to be a Chinese kind and they are going to contribute to the Church of God something that we could not contribute. (Applause.) Here is one thing that is outstanding along this line. When we look out over the world we find Jews in every nation under the sun and they cannot be absorbed; they are always Jews. In China the Jews came in probably two thousand years ago, probably longer than that. They had synagogues at one time wherever they had their Jewish communities and in those places they carried on their Jewish practices. But today there is no trace of Chinese Jews; they are Chinese. I could tell you of my attempts to revive the colony of Jews in the city where I live. We have tried to organize them, we have promised them a synagogue on a site which has come into our hands, and the memorial stones are kept in our hands. They said, "The Anglicans are the successors of the Jews, and we are not going to carry on any longer". The head Jew came back from Hong Kong and said: "In Hong Kong I went into the Anglican Church and I told them I was an Anglican." I said: "That was not true; we have been trying to get you to come to church here and you say you do not want to be a Christian." He said he thought it would be diplomatic there to keep in touch with the Anglicans because they are very high in HongKong. (Laughter.)

The third matter is their essential unity. Some people think the Chinese are divided, north and south. They are fighting against each other now, but let any country go into China to interfere, and you would find them come together immediately. The Chinese are one. There is no greater difference between the southern and the northern people than between the races of Great Britain, in fact not so great. I know they speak different dialects in the south, and the Canton dialect is different from that of the north; but underneath even the spoken dialects you find a common language, that is the written language, common to the whole of China. Actually it is the language of Japan, because the classics of Japan are really the classics of China, and it is written in the same way. There is an essential unity there.

The fourth thing is the greatness of her people. You cannot live in China without being greatly impressed by that. You get to love them and the more you live there, the more you feel they are a big people; they draw out your respect. I would like to quote Professor Flinders Petrie, where he lays great emphasis upon that fact and points out that China has those qualities, in which perhaps we are lacking. The astonishing thing, he says, is that people who live out there get to love them; and that is true.

Those are four very important things as we look over the past. What do they augur for the future?

First of all is the thought that China will be great in the councils of the world's peace. The Chinese are not fighters. They seem to be fighting each other just now; you would think they are a warlike people, but they are not. They hate war. The class of soldiers was placed at the very bottom of the list of professions; the Chinese people do not like it. Today they are fighting for principles, they are fighting for ideals, for what nationalism has taught them, that they must be a free people, able to express themselves. It is self-expression they want, and so they are doing that today, but they are not really in themselves a fighting people. Go back in their history and you find so many things that point to that. You find, for instance, that the very first League of Nations is to be found in China. In 546 B. C. fourteen of those feudal nations were joined together to stop war and signed a document; that is a most interesting thing. (Applause.) You will find when China comes into her rightful place among the nations of the world, her word with regard to international matters will be for peace.

The next point is that she is great in literature and learning. I need not touch upon that. Her literature is unsurpassed; there is a tremendous amount of it not yet explored even by themselves. There it is, a wonderful literature and there is something now taking place in China that is going to transform the people of China, who are immature, unlettered. There is only a very small portion of Chinese literate, and something like ninety per cent. illiterate. There is a movement going on that we speak of as the mass education movement. Chinese is an exceedingly difficult language and so complicated in writing that it has hindered the matter of literacy of the masses. That mass education movement is sweeping from north and east to west and south, and it will not be long before you find these people will be able to read and write their own language and the common people will be able to get learning.

The third point is they are great in commerce. British merchants say the Chinese are just like ourselves in that regard, they are great merchants. After his trip around the world, General U. S. Grant was asked what he considered the most interesting thing he had seen in his travels, and he said, "In a port in China there were two merchants, one was a Jew and the other a Chinese;

they were rivals and the Jew was run out of the place by the Chinaman." (Laughter.) Think for a minute of China as a market for Canadian produce. The imports into China of wheat in 1922 were 4¼ million dollars Mexican; in 1923 they had raised to 12¾ million in 1924 to 24 million. The same with regard to flour; in 1922, 23¾ million dollars Mexican, in 1923, 38 million; in 1924, 42¼ million. What does that mean? It means that the Chinese are becoming a wheat-eating people. On the other hand, what about rice? You find a decrease of rice from Saigon and the Straits Settlements, from 1922 when there was a matter of 112 million dollars' worth, to 1924 when it had gone down to 89¼ million. For a wheat-growing country like Canada there is going to be a great market in China.

China is great in industry. The industrial age of China has not begun. There are many at home, I believe, who have been misled on that point. They have said that merchants have exploited China on the industrial side, but the industrial situation has not begun. When it does begin the whole world will know it, because of the cheapness of labor. I think I ought here, in justice to British industrialists, to mention this. They have said that British merchants and industrialists have exploited woman labor and child labor and I have seen things in papers here in Canada along that line. The facts are these: A labor government in England, under Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, sent out and had that whole situation investigated, and it has come out in a blue book just recently, showing very clearly that British industrialists have not been exploiting China. (Hear, hear.) With regard for instance to the cotton mills, that is one great industry that is coming into being in China, it is shown that two-thirds of all the machinery in all the factories in China is from British sources. The capital in the cotton mills is 57 million dollars Chinese capital, 136 millions Japanese, and only five millions British. So you see the proportion, practically one-fortieth only is British capital. Then with regard to the mills themselves, out of a total of 122 factories, 73 are Chinese owned, 45 are Japanese owned, and four only are British owned. So really there is not much of a problem. Then when you come to the conditions, this blue book shows that factory conditions are away ahead of the Chinese themselves. The Chinese do not carry out their regulations.

Fourthly, they are overwhelmingly great in population. I was astonished two or three days ago in receiving the last papers from Pekin to see the last population given by the Postal Administration. I have been saying the population was increasing, and probably in ten years' time it would be 450 million people. Here is the last census, given by the Postal Administration, who have been working for years on this: 485,508,000 odd. They have been increasing in the last four years, since the last census, as far as you can take a census there, something like ten million a year. When you think of better hygienic conditions coming into being there, when you think of the breaking down of the old idea of the clan being at one spot and not able to move because of their idea of ancestor worship—that has broken down now and they are spreading all over China and the densely populated parts are being disintegrated and these people are going to Manchuria, for instance, where they have great grain-growing land—when you think of these things, I say, you will see that China will grow at a tremendous rate. It has grown at a tremendous rate now. Here is a country with this overwhelming population coming now to be able to stand on an equality with the other nations, equipped in a modern way, educated in a modern way, beginning now along this line of industry with the cheapest labor in the world, and with a stock with hardiness of physique and with capacities for endurance, astonishing capacities, when you think of that, what is going to happen to the world? It will mean that China will be almost the dominating country in the whole world.

It seems to me that the interests of Canada require that we should be on the very best terms with China. (Hear, hear.) We ought to understand that nation better, understand her history, understand her culture, understand her national aspirations and aims. There are two institutions in Canada that are working along this line. One is McGill University where they have the beginnings of a very fine library of Chinese things and they are developing a Chinese department in that University. That is where, it seems to me, the University of Toronto is lacking. But there is something that Toronto has, and practically Toronto University, which is going to mean a great deal, and that is the Royal Ontario Museum with the best collection, I suppose, of Chinese antiquities that you will find in any museum that I know of. It is attached to the University, there is every facility there for students for the investigation of Chinese culture and Chinese things, and that being so it seems to me it ought to be more developed; a Chinese department ought to be developed in connection with Toronto University, so as to make available to the utmost this wonderful collection that we have in the Ontario Museum.

There is a great future for China, and if Canada swings and has close relationships of harmony and good-will with China, our children in days to come will benefit from these close contacts of good-will and good fellowship. (Applause.)

The thanks of the club were extended to the speaker by Bishop Stringer of the Yukon, who was present as a guest of the Club.

GOOD CITIZENSHIP

AN ADDRESS BY BRIG. GEN. D. G. DRAPER, C.M.G., D.S.O., CHIEF CONSTABLE OF TORONTO.

3rd May, 1928

PRESIDENT FENNELL introduced the speaker, who spoke as follows: It is with a considerable amount of apprehension that I rise to address you, and long before I have taken my seat you will have discovered that I am, to say the least, no orator. But I could not refuse to accept the very kind invitation from such a distinguished organization as this, and I shall endeavor in a conversational way to have a talk with you for a short time only. It being my first appearance in this beautiful city, naturally I have tried to reflect my best intelligence into a few words that you would accept and say, "Well, we have greeted the new Chief, he has expressed his pleasure; now let us carry on." (Applause.)

As you are well aware, I am a native of the Province of Quebec. My ancestors, like those of many citizens of Toronto, came there as United Empire Loyalists and settled in the Eastern Townships—(Applause.)—where like all pioneers they hewed down forests and cleared farms, as did the founders of this magnificent city. The large majority of the citizens of Quebec Province being French Canadian, naturally they have overflowed, and they cover many places formerly occupied by English-speaking people. This is what has happened to a large extent in the Eastern Townships, and while I can never forget the kindness of the French-Canadian, it is impossible to obliterate from my memory the tradition of my own family and those who joined with them in raising the flag to which we are all pleased today to bow. (Applause.) The English-speaking people of the Townships have, for the most part, become scattered throughout Canada. Some of them have even come to Toronto, and that contingent I am now joining with every anticipation of pleasant relationships, and with every hope of being a good citizen of this community. (Applause.)

It is about what a good citizen should be, that the few words I have to say to you will have to do. In the future I will have a good deal to do with bad citizens therefore I prefer to think of the good ones, for the more good citizens we have in Toronto, the less bad ones we will have to deal with. The very name, Mr. President, of this club suggests that its members possess the first requisite of good citizenship in this country, namely, loyalty to the British Empire. (Applause.) Canada earned her nationhood in the Great War, but the men who died in the fields of France and Flanders were fighting for the British Empire, and for all that it means in the progress of humanity. The next requisite of good citizenship in this country is to be good Canadians. We like to talk of the grain fields of the West, from which a distinguished member of this gathering, Mr. Meighen, comes, of the hills and the mountains, of our vast mineral and water-power resources, and all the other things with which Nature has endowed us, but I think the hand of man comes into contact with these; they are but silent partners. This brings us to the thought of how important it is that the citizenship of our country should be of a high character and endowed with the true and loyal patriotism, and educated to conserve and not to destroy the gifts of nature. Therefore I say without hesitation that notwithstanding all of the wealth of natural endowment which Canada possesses, the character and quality of her citizenship will be a much greater factor in her future progress. (Applause.) The place that Canada will take in the future among nations will depend far more upon her citizens than on her material resources. (Hear, hear.)

Coming nearer home, a requisite of good citizenship in Toronto is loyalty to our city. I do not know whether you are aware of it or not, but in some of the outlying districts, this city is often referred to as "Toronto the

Good." Inhabitants of certain other cities, when speaking this way, flatter themselves that they are using a term which in a humorous way may be called reproach, but we can very well afford to disregard them as long as the citizens of Toronto are good citizens, even if not always righteous. (Laughter.) Now let the other outsiders be jealous; it is our place to let them continue to have cause for jealousy. An important requisite of good citizenship in Toronto is observance of law and order. (Hear, hear.) Now, I am not saying this altogether with my own task in view. A good citizen will not knowingly break any law, and in these modern days of very complex life, it is very hard to keep track of all the laws and avoid violating them. (Laughter.) Just as the pedestrian has to be more alert and agile with the construction of every new automobile, so the citizen has to become more careful with the enactment of every new law. I often think that our lawmakers, whether federal, provincial or municipal—with apologies to those present—should bear this fact in mind, and give more thought than they sometimes do before imposing a new law on a long-suffering public. (Applause.) We have a pretty good example of the result of the enactment of too many laws, and of laws difficult to enforce, in the country to the south of us, without desiring to be too critical,—and, mind you, I am not referring or alluding in any way to the prohibition law of the United States. (Laughter.) On that subject I have absolutely nothing to say. However, there is no doubt that the violation of one law—and I consider this important—leads to the violation of other laws, and then to disrespect of all laws. (Hear, hear.) Well then, the good citizen of Toronto will observe all laws, whether he likes them or not. He will not drive a car while intoxicated; I would like to lay special stress on that. (Applause.) Indeed his standard of citizenship will be higher if he never becomes intoxicated. (Hear, hear.) He will not be careless of his cigarette butt; he will not expectorate on the sidewalk. You may think this is small, but, gentlemen, it comes within the range of the duties of a certain class of the citizenship of this city,—to say nothing of countless greater and more obvious crimes—but his duty does not end there. He will take a pride in his city, and it is very easy to take a pride in such a beautiful city as this. I make that statement, gentlemen, after having gone over the city well, having reflected in my mind on other cities I have had the good fortune to visit, and at this moment, in duty to you as citizens of this city I have to compliment you on having, if not the finest, one of the finest cities that I have ever been in. (Applause.)

It is necessary for the good citizen to go much further than this, and to possess positive virtues; I have been speaking of the negative virtues. At the present time, as you know, attention is being drawn to the city of Ottawa, in a national way, on account of the government scheme of beautifying. Without speaking disparagingly of the city of Ottawa, we all know that the government of our country have expended a considerable amount of money in beautifying the city, the driveway and other things having been constructed by reason of it being the Capital of our noble Dominion. In Toronto these problems have been solved, but there is always room for improvement, therefore the good citizen will always be on the alert.

He will also see that he does his share in social service. It is true that Toronto is fortunate in having, in proportion to its size, less of a burden than most other cities have to carry in this respect, but the poor and the unforunate and the outcast we have always with us. A good citizen will not forget his duty when a community effort to help these people is being made. (Applause.)

I do not intend to make more than a passing reference to the force of men whose duty it is to protect the lives and property of the citizens of this city. But one thing which will make certain the success of these men, and which is absolutely necessary if they are to succeed, is the constant and hearty cooperation of all citizens. (Hear, hear, and applause.) Without this, our task would be impossible, but with it we cannot possibly fail.

Everyone who has visited London, England, has been struck by the efficiency of the London bobby, and the wonderful display of law and order which prevails at all times in that great city. This state of affairs could only have been brought about by the interest and pride which the citizens of London take as a matter of tradition in the welfare of their city. In many cities to the south of us we see the results of the opposite state of affairs—again with apologies, and no desire to criticize the Americans. Without that tradition of law and order, and civic consciousness, which is the heritage of the people of Britain, and when public opinion does not give proper support to those whose task it is to enforce the law, the results have become in some cases almost appalling.

The good citizen looks to the future. We have no doubt that Canada in years to come will be one of the greatest countries of the world. Our vast natural resources make this certain. But it is necessary that we see to it that the future citizenship of the country will be worthy of their heritage. The children of today —and I wish to lay special stress on this statement —are going to be the possessors of a wonderful heritage. The good citizen will see to it that they are worthy, by providing the proper home influences for his own children, and by seeing that the children of the less fortunate have some chance to make good. For after all, the home is the only place where the future generations can be properly trained and prepared for life. It is clear that the Juvenile Court is not the place for this, and yet the Juvenile Court can help society. I am not reflecting on the Court, but desire to impress the duty of the citizen himself in his own home.

I have, after all, said very little about good citizenship, and told you nothing you did not know before, but I have told you what we who have the task of maintaining order in the city expect of you. Gentlemen, I desire to extend to you once more my sincere thanks for your kind invitation, and sincerely trust that I may be of service to you all individually and as a community. I thank you. (Applause.)

The thanks of the club were tendered to the speaker by Brigadier General Bell.

OVERSEAS SETTLEMENT

AN ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. LORD LOVAT, K.T., D.S.O., K.C.M.G. UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE, OVERSEAS DOMINIONS

22nd August, 1928

PRESIDENT FENNELL occupied the Chair and introduced the distinguished speaker, who was received with applause and spoke as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Prime Minister, and Gentlemen: It is a very great pleasure indeed for me to come today to address the members of the Empire Club. It think my first duty as an Under Secretary of the Home Government is to say something to you about—shall I say?—the progress of the Empire, or perhaps I might say more correctly the consolidation of the Empire which has been going on in the last year or two. I do believe that these last three years have been years fraught with significance for the future. The year 1926 was the year of the great Imperial Conference, probably the greatest of all the Imperial Conferences that have been held, in which, first and foremost, under the leadership of that veteran statesman, Lord Balfour, the definition of the status of the dominions was defined and accepted by every constituent member of the Empire. What had never been put on paper, what everyone knew to be a fact, what everyone thought was the right and just position, was recorded and made clear for all time. The year 1927 was a year devoted by the dominions and the non-self-governing colonies to carrying out and looking into the detail of the decisions made at that great conference of 1926. It was a year of conferences of sectional work rather than conferences of the Empire as a whole. In that year, you will remember, one of the most important conferences of mining and metallurgy that has ever been held in the Empire was held in your country. In the same year a Royal Commission was appointed to go into the question of Indian Government. The first meeting of twenty-seven governors of the non-self-governing colonies was held; and most important decisions were arrived at for an area in its totality greater than the United States, with a population of 55 million, mostly natives.

There were conferences on education, there were conferences on agricultural research, and there were conferences on research on other lines, which were held in various parts of the Empire. But I think the note, like the note of 1926, was one of decision of big principles; the note of 1927 in the Empire was the question of bringing together specialists from all parts of the Empire and seeing how they could cooperate to advance the vast and varied interests of the Empire. I had the honor of taking part in two of those conferences, or really I should say three of those conferences. For the conference into agricultural research there was no country, no dominion, which gave greater assistance to the great work of agricultural research than your Dominion of Canada, under the leadership of Dr. Drysdale. We had the opportunity of getting all these men together, of deciding how the individual work which was being done in these various dominions should be brought together, how clearing houses could be established for the purpose of disseminating information and also grouping together research work in the various lines that were being carried out. Even in agriculture alone the divisions of work which that conference had to undertake was unexpectedly large, and the number of bureaux which it thought should be established for a period to get the best results of the research of the Empire was literally astonishing. I would humbly offer the opinion that when the next Imperial Conference is held, one of the subjects that may be debated will be not only how the centres can be brought together in our various works—because that is already well on its way—but also how the whole Empire, can make the best use of its resources, what steps can be taken to the rationalization of industries, and how advice can be obtained on the best use of the capital which is in the Empire.

All of us believe that great industries are often started with too little knowledge of conditions, and that an adequate examination of facts by disinterested persons might yield information of mutual value within all parts of the Empire. Anyone who has given consideration to the special lines of research to which I refer cannot get away from the opinion that invaluable research work is being done all over the Empire. The question is to focus the results and make it available to all concerned. It is therefore on the question of obtaining and distributing such knowledge, I submit, that the next Conference will have much to say.

May I talk on the subject of the dissemination of information? May I say one word about its application to the subject which I have come over here to deal with, a corner of the Empire's work on which I am occupied at the present time,—I mean the question of migration? Gentlemen, I say it without fear of contradiction that if either we in England knew and were able to appreciate the position in the dominions, or if you knew and were able to appreciate the conditions at home, the migration question would be solved at once. (Hear, hear, and applause.) It is because we get your information only in little packets that we do not know exactly what you want, on one side, or what we are able to give you, on the other, that misunderstandings sometimes may arise. There is no question that if we knew all the work which has been done by individual societies,—all those opportunities that offer, we could make the best possible use of such knowledge, and the question of unemployment at home, or lack of hands in places where they are needed, would be in a fair way to a satisfactory solution. There is no wish in the home country to send a single man abroad who will not fill his niche, any more than I am certain there is in Canada, or any other dominion, where there is an opportunity, a wish not to fill it with a Britisher. (Applause.) It is, therefore, in, first of all getting this information, and secondly, in being able to make use of it, that I do feel great progress can be made; and when my chief, Mr. Amery, accepted my suggestion that I should go around the Empire to study for myself, first in the three big dominions who are interested in this subject, I felt that progress could be made. And I do feel that even in this very short time which I have spent in your midst, I have become acquainted with phases of the problem which I had not in any sense realized when I was on the other side. And in saying that I speak also for those who are with me, Mr. Plant of my department and Mr. Skimington from the Treasury. I believe that continuing thus in close touch over these subjects, not only helps us greatly in that particular regard, but still more forms a link with the Empire, because when people by personal contact can see nearer the same views, there follows an elimination of points which otherwise might eventually lead to friction. I spent this morning in visiting some of your voluntary associations, and I was struck by the wonderful work which is being done. I think those voluntary associations require close connection, not only with us at home, but we hope also, as they have indeed in a majority of cases, with the governments as well, so that we may steer a steady and easy course for the future. We are not all wise, even in the presence of my friend here—(Hon. Mr. Ferguson)—even governments are not all wise, and I think by bringing voluntary associations in close touch with governments it may help us, between the two, to arrive at the results which we all so much desire.

There are facts, some of which we see frequently mentioned, about which I would like to make a very short statement. Most of us at home have little knowledge of the statistics of openings that occur in the dominions. Even in Great Britain, which is a small island, we have no certainty about the numbers of openings for employment which occur every year. I believe I am correct in saying it was not until the report of the Commission, which reported only a short time ago, that it became general knowledge in Great Britain that in the ordinary course of development in that old country, there are no less than 125,000 new billets coming in industry every year. That may be news to you here. Great Britain is an old country that has nearly reached what is thought to be the top of its development, but even in that old country there are no less than 125,000 new billets yearly, and this will likely continue, as far as the statisticians can judge, for some time to come. Now I would like to put it to you as a guess: What is the total number of new billets that are coming in every year, not only in Canada, but in Australia, New Zealand, Africa, and the non-self-governing colonies? The number must be enormous. It is a question of seeing where they are, filling them where it is possible by suitable Britishers, and in that way, on the one side, bringing the information to the place where it is required.

I mention this as an example of how valuable, disseminative information is, and how important not only the getting of it is but the bringing of it to the place where it can be taken advantage of.

May I say one word further on the situation as we view it in Britain at the present day? We have as you know, considerable unemployment; we have in certain industries something like 200,000 or 300,000 men of the best class who are not likely, in view of economic conditions on the continent, to be able to return to their own work. These are fit and good men, the older of whom fought in the war, the younger of whom are anxious to serve in a new country. When we have cleared away which is after all not a temporary matter—when we have cleared away by the appropriate disposal of the employable which are the vast majority I believe our policy after that, in the future, will be to organize ourselves so that young men, from twenty-one and downwards, may make a continual stream from home to the dominions for all time, to pursue and to keep those ideals of Britain on which the dominions have been built. (Applause.)

I believe we have a temporary yet a great effort in sight if we are to overcome this quite temporary unemployment, and I believe that afterwards we can then all join together in a matter which I know to be in the heart of every true Empire man throughout this great Empire of ours, the idea of maintaining that connection, and by getting out the younger men, who, at the same time that they have the British tradition, can take on their dominion tradition, and on that make not 100 per cent. Britishers, but 110 per cent. Britishers and servants of the Empire. (Applause.)

I must thank you very sincerely for having listened to me so kindly. It is a great pleasure to me to address your club. I do trust that we shall all be able to go forward with the great ideals we have of our great Empire and that you will be able to give practical assistance in what I believe is for the moment the greatest question in respect to the Empire, the most advisable distribution of the white population; and nothing can be done more to achieve this best distribution than by getting ready the necessary information on the subject, so that we shall not only be able to act, but to act to the best advantage. (Hear, hear, and applause.)

The thanks of the club were tendered to the speaker by Sir William Mulock.

INDUSTRIAL CONDITIONS IN THE HOMELAND

AN ADDRESS BY RIGHT HONORABLE HUGH P. MACMILLAN, P.C., K.C. FORMER LORD ADVOCATE OF SCOTLAND

(*Before a Joint Meeting of the Empire Club and the Canadian Club,*)

19th September, 1928

MR. R. O. DALY, President of the Canadian Club, presided and introduced the speaker, who was received with applause and spoke as follows. An English friend of mine one day went back to his place in the Highlands, and the next morning went down to the riverside to see his gillie, and ask him about the fishing. He found the old man and said, "Well, Donald, and how is the world treating you?" And Donald's answer was "Very seldom." (Laughter and applause.) Gentlemen, that has not been my experience as your guest in Canada. (Laughter.) Do not misunderstand me. (Laughter.) I make no reflection whatever upon the admirable revenue system of Ontario. (Laughter.) I am glad to be here in this loyal city of Toronto, to take the opportunity of thanking you for the welcome you have given me. I know that you do not care for conventional adulation; neither do I. On the other hand I think you may care to have from me a few reflections by the way.

In the last forty-eight hours there have been a series of incidents in my life which together seem to me to be typical of the life of this great Dominion. The first one is on a note of pathos. As our train, a couple of nights ago, drew in at Sioux Lookout, a name itself redolent of the romantic history of Canada, I observed a coffin being carried along on a porter's barrow and put on the train. I asked about it and I was told that it was the body of a young Scotchman in the service of the Hudson's Bay Company, that body misnamed "A Company of adventurers of *England* trading into Hudson's Bay." And this lad had only come out from Scotland a few months ago, and had gone up country and had met his fate in a canoe accident on the river, and his body was being shipped back to Scotland for burial. It seemed to me rather striking that one should have brought so vividly before one at this day the perils and the adventures of the old days in Canada in that dramatic form, and I realized that although here we meet with all the appanage of civilization in a great city, yet close at hand the old life of adventure and pioneering is still going on in Canada, the life which has made so many of the great heroes of Canadian history.

From that incident I passed in a few hours to a visit to one of the great paper mills in the north of your province, and there I saw the process whereby the immemorial forests of Canada are being converted into newsprint. I think hereafter we shall have to regard the spruce as being the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. (Laughter and applause.) You will recall, I suppose, that the word for a book, "liber," is itself derived from bark, the old books in the classical period or the pre-classical period, being written on bark. But I observe in these big paper mills that the first thing to do was to shred all the bark off, and now it is the wood itself that is reduced to pulp and then converted into these wonderful rolls of paper, which are thereafter rendered more, or perhaps, less, valuable, by what is imprinted upon them. It gave me really a thrill to see great train-loads of paper pulling out every day, going in this particular instance to the States, for the purpose of carrying news throughout the whole of the world.

Then the next episode was a visit to one of the gold mines, and in no time whatever I found myself precipitated into the bowels of the earth and making my way along underground passages, reminding one of nothing so much as the pictures with which Gustave

Doré illustrated Dante's Inferno. I need scarcely say how interested I was. I have been down coal pits before, but I had never been down a gold mine. I was a little disappointed; I thought I would see gold nuggets sticking all over the place, but I merely saw some strata of quartz which looked rather uninteresting, but which, I was told, contained the precious metal. I was not trusted with any of it. I realized from that visit and what I heard of other great mines that are developed in the north of your province, how very soon it would be that South Africa would have to look to its laurels, and Canada become, not as I think it is about to be, the second gold producing country, but the first gold producing country in the world. (Applause.)

Then my next visit was to a copper mine, and there I saw one of the most to my mind, dramatic industrial exhibitions I ever saw, when you saw the ore passing through the furnace and the copper issuing in a stream into the crucibles, and ultimately run off into the ingots or pigs of copper. A magnificent process being carried on with the greatest possible efficiency out in that distant outpost of your province.

Then again a little later we passed a wayside station where my eye was caught at once by the beauty of that station garden there in the wilds, a beautiful garden full of old English roses, glorious gladioli and a little green lawn. I asked my companions about it and I was told that the man who is posted there was a great lover of gardens, and is one of the most efficient men on the line. We never prompted him but I saw him gathering a bouquet of flowers, and in a few minutes he was up by our car and he handed my wife a beautiful bouquet of old English flowers. That was a very charming incident, and I was delighted to see that in a region which is now developing on the industrial side so vigorously and actively, there was still a place for those simpler and more charming pleasures of life. And then a little further down the line I was taken into a conservatory where I was shown a whole lot of plants being brought on, and I got a hint there that I am going to take back to the Old Country, where I have a good deal to do with the railways. This was a conservatory where plants were being brought up for distribution to the stations along the line in order that the men might take some interest in their stations and cultivate flowers. I am going to tell the men in the Old Country. We have competitions there as to whose is the best station, and I think this encouragement by the management is a splendid thing.

My day ended with a magnificent drive through the primeval forest along the road which I am glad to know is worthily associated with the name of my friend the Prime Minister, the Ferguson Highway. (Applause). If all his works of public utility are as beautiful as that, then I congratulate you on your Prime Minister, because he certainly gave me an afternoon of undiluted pleasure as we drove through that magnificent national heritage, preserved, and so wisely preserved, for the future. With the autumn tints appearing on all the trees, and beautiful lakes shimmering in the level rays of the sun, I said, "This is indeed a good land, a goodly heritage which you do well to preserve for the future." We in the Old Country are trying now to recover from the results of industrial destruction; you here are taking time by the forelock and are arranging, as you can arrange in a new country, to appropriate provinces of pleasure and toil. We are only trying to sort them out again now, because we set out with no original plan, but you here can lay out your country as you will, and one of the most interesting things to me has been to see how wisely you are allocating to the different provinces of life their proper share of the earth's surface.

Gentlemen, there in forty-eight hours I had an incident that recalled the old pioneering days of the Hudson's Bay Company, I had had a visit to a most up-to-date and magnificent mine, to a great paper producing mill, and then a little human incident, concluding with a magnificent drive through natural scenery. Was there ever a better epitome of Canada. Sentiment and adventure, industry and enterprise, and admiration for the beautiful. And I felt today that it was only due from me in common gratitude to you to express the sense of appreciation which I felt in having thus represented to me within the span of only forty-eight hours a complete epitome of all the finest and worthiest characteristics of this great Dominion. After all, gentlemen, there is a tremendous lot in sentiment. It may seem almost indecent for a lawyer to speak about sentiment, (Laughter.) but lawyers themselves are as sentimental as anybody else, and I feel that sentiment that does not degenerate into sentimentality is probably the biggest thing in the world. We may pretend to be above it, but we are not the least above it. I remember standing at Westminster one day this summer; a large number of newly enfranchised women had been brought up to see the Houses of Parliament and to learn their duties and to be impressed indeed by the members of parliament who were looking after them. But at that moment a carriage and pair drove past, and in it was the little Princess Elizabeth, and I can assure you that not one of those members, who came there to attend to politics and talk about their principles gave a thought to them after that. Their whole interest was in the little princess and I am bound to say, I am exactly the same myself. That is not childish, gentlemen, it stands for something very big; it stands for our recognition of the bond that binds us all together, the bond of sentiment and loyalty which it is very difficult to attach to a committee or a president or a chairman, but which you can attach to a throne. (Applause.)

Now, gentlemen, there is one thing I would like to say and that is of a practical nature. Here am I among you; I have come not to impart knowledge, but to acquire knowledge, and through your hospitality and generosity my education has been advancing by leaps and bounds, I am bound to say also at the rate of about forty miles an hour for the last six weeks. And the feeling that I have about it is this that we want more interpreters of each other to each other. (Hear, hear, and applause.) Many courteous members of the press have interviewed me, and I have said to them this, I miss very much indeed in the papers at home an adequate reflection of the life and interests of the Dominion. It is not because there is not a welcome for material of that sort in our press it is because the material is not provided. You, gentlemen, in this country, are perhaps too busy doing things to talk about doing things. In the Old Country there is perhaps more leisure to think about those who in other parts of the Empire are doing things. I should like very much to see more articles in the English and Scottish papers, not merely articles upon the dividends paid by your gold mines, excellent things as they are, or upon commercial matters, but upon the real spirit of the country. I do not think I could do it, but there are others. There are people like my friend, John Buchan, for instance, who I think has addressed you in this room; there are men of that sort who can write about what they see, and I am satisfied from my knowledge of my own friends at home that they, not having been privileged as I have been to come amongst you, have not really the least idea of your life and interests and your history. I say that in no disparagement of them; it is because they have not the means, the material is not put before them, and I think some of you might do well in the cause of Canada if you were to enlist, not merely penny-a-liners, but enlist a few of the greatest writers of the age who can write well and truly on the things that matter in Canada, not merely the great financial interests, which are always carefully chronicled, but upon the things that interest you, the history of Canada, the beauties of Canada, the intellectual development of Canada, which is advancing so rapidly—topics of that sort.

I will give you an instance. This spring I saw in *The Times*, in the best part of *The Times*, an article which at once caught my attention; it was on the Mounties. Hitherto I had only known in a vague way about the old Northwest Mounted Police, now the Canadian Mounted Police. I had heard about them but I now learned about them, though I am a comparatively well educated Scotsman. I read a column and a half and it inspired me at once. I said, "This is magnificent." I hastened away to my clerk and applied to the Canada House to get the last blue book report on the Mounted Police, which I read with the greatest interest and found that history was being made in Canada and that the old traditions were still being maintained in this year of grace. If it had not been for that article in that English paper I would not have known about it except in the vaguest possible way. Now I know a great deal about it, because I have bought about half a dozen books, some of them novels, some historical books, on the Northwest Mounted Police, and I am prepared to pass an examination on it with any gentlemen in this room. (Laughter.)

That is only one instance. There is a matter of the intensest interest to us all, a case where the best traditions of our country have been upheld and filled with a romantic aroma. It is part of our heritage. What I would like to see is your other interests brought home to us from time to time in attractive and interesting articles. The thing ought to work both ways. I have rather missed in the press here articles telling you about affairs at home. You always hear if there has been a murder trial or a divorce case, news of that sort—and it is quite proper to chronicle these matters—but there are matters of much more importance happening at home than murders and divorces, and I should like to see the presence in the Canadian press of more articles written by people who understand Canada and who can reproduce the current history of affairs at home in such a way as to make it interesting and palatable to readers in Canada. (Hear, hear.) There is no link so valuable as that, and it only wants doing. There is lots of ability, and lots of men who can write well, even these days, and the press is always alive to what the public wants. If you can show the press that you are anxious to have that side of journalism developed, the press is ready to rise to the occasion and can, now-a-days, with its resources, lay under contribution the greatest minds of the day.

Another thing I want to say is this. The position at home is perhaps not always so well appreciated here, just for the reason that interpreters are needed. We have been having a very difficult time at home, but it is not so bad as those who would like it to be bad have been making out. (Hear, hear.) I can give one or two figures which I venture to offer you. Since Mr. Baldwin took over office, 360,000 more persons have entered registered employment in the British Isles. More millions of men and women are employed in the Old Country than ever before, and at a higher average level of well-being. (Applause.) We still own one third of the world's shipping and build one half of the whole world's ships. (Applause.) And the Old Country pays all its debts. (Applause.) It hits us pretty hard, it hits us in taxation on a scale which you would regard as almost shattering. I put it to myself in this way, that for practically five months out of twelve I work exclusively for His Majesty's Revenue. That is not an exaggeration, gentlemen. If you work it out it comes to about that. Of every pound you make, you hand over first 4/6 to His Majesty, that is merely 25% right away in income taxes, and in addition to that if you are fortunate enough or unfortunate enough to have more than £10,000 a year, you have to pay super-tax on a very stiff graded scale above that up to 50%. Consequently it is no exaggeration to say that a reasonably successful lawyer—not, of course, in the American scale of success, but on the Scottish or English scale—is in point of fact for about four or five months of the year working exclusively to pay the debts of the nation and keep up the head of the country in the world. And the result is that Lombard Street is still the financial centre of the world, and Wall Street has failed to secure that position. (Applause.)

There is of course the practical and difficult side to it all. It is true we have over a million unemployed. These are the surplus which our industries have not been able to develop fast enough to overtake. We have maintained, as I say, the output of our industries, we have maintained the pre-war level of employment in quantity, but we have not been able to absorb the excess, the natural increase of population by a corresponding growth of our industry, and that in turn has been due largely to the difficulties in the basic industries of iron and coal. I am not going into these economic questions here and now; they are extraordinarily interesting, some of them, but I am hopeful that the tide is turning there also. Mr. Baldwin has devised a method that will go a certain distance, which will not be a panacea but it will be a palliative, to help the basic industries in this way, that he is giving a certain measure of relief from local taxes to the railway companies on condition that they apply the entire amount of the rebate in a diminution of their freight charges for certain of the basic industries. The railway companies are not themselves to benefit by the rebate in taxation, but they are to reflect it absolutely in a diminution of freight charges. In this way we may be able to take a certain amount, a few pence, off the ton of coal, and every penny we can take off the ton of our export coal means an advance of, say, fifty miles into the European continent. The economic frontier which we are up against moves back and forward in Europe according to the price of our coal, and every penny we can take off the ton enables us to make a little advance in competition with the coal fields of Poland and France and Germany. Some relief will undoubtedly come from the improved conditions generally, and best of all from the improved industrial spirit. (Hear, hear.) I would like to tell you one personal incident, because a concrete instance is worth a ton of theory. I do not think I am being indiscreet, but if I am I do not care a bit. This spring one day in my chambers at Westminster in London, just opposite the Victoria Tower, I was waited upon by a deputation. It was the most interesting deputation I ever received in my life. It was composed of four or five trade union leaders and four or five employers. They represented the great ship-building industries, the painters, the carpenters, the electricians, fitters, and all these able men who are engaged in our ship-building industry, one of the most difficult industries economically, and one that has perhaps suffered worse than any other. On the other side were half a dozen leaders in the ship-building industries, representing Harland & Wolff, and others who are all associated in the Ship Builders Federation. They produced to me an agreement and they said, "Mr. Macmillan, we have entered into an agreement that there shall be no strikes in our industry until the question at issue has been discussed between us at a local conference where the trouble has arisen. If an agreement cannot be reached there, it is to go to a larger conference, and if an agreement is still not reached by conciliation and conversation, it shall go to a central conference where the whole trades shall be represented by their trade union leaders and by the leading employers. And we have provided for an independent chairman. The Minister of Labor is to appoint the independent chairman to mediate between us if we cannot agree upon one, but the employers and employees have agreed in asking you to be chairman." (Applause.) This is not told you in a spirit of egotism; I am telling you that for this reason: I was more moved than I can say by the spirit which was exhibited on that occasion. One man there, the chief spokesman on the trade union side, whom I had known as a man who had been through some of the worst trade union disputes, turned to me and said, "Mr. Macmillan, we mean this; this is not eye wash; we mean this; we have come to realize that strikes and strife mean loss for us all and we hope that through this medium we may be able to diminish the element of strife, the element of grit from the machine. We do not make you an arbitrator, you observe; we have not reached the stage of compulsory arbitration, we think that is sometimes a mistake; but we do think that if we can have it out in the presence of someone who will mediate between us, and elicit from one side or the other the factors we might not elicit from each other, if we do not agree in these circumstances, it must be because it is not susceptible of agreement; and we are sure machinery of that sort will go a long way to eliminate senseless stupid disputes." I am sure that is a true forecast. That is only one incident.

The Trades Union Congress recently has given its wholehearted approval to the policy of industrial reconciliation. Gentlemen, all strife is loss, not only for employers but employees, and the sooner that is realized throughout the world the better. (Applause.) I am happy to be able to report to you today from many small experiences, and from the much larger experience of others that has been reported to me, that that great fact is being realized, and that we may look forward, not to a millenium, because no trades union leaders and no employers are going to grow wings all of a sudden—and I am not sure that it would be advantageous if they did—but we may look forward to an infinitely more reasonable relationship between capital and labor, between employer and workman, than has marked the past tragic year. In that there is great hope for us all. You have your industrial crises here; the problems have perhaps not been so acute with you because this is the land of opportunity, and you do not suffer as we do from a large surplus population, not of work-shy men, but men of ability, the great bulk of them, who are thwarted by the lack of opportunity in the Old Land. There is no use in sending out to Canada people who are failures at home—(Hear, hear.) I thought that would interest you—if their failure is due to lack of ability; but, gentlemen, if their failure is due to want of opportunity, what then? I am satisfied that there are among the surplus men of our country, especially the younger ones, dozens and dozens who would be useful citizens in this country, who are men eager and ready to work but who are suffering from what is the most distressing of all things, the thwarted desire to make good in this world, which is due simply to the fact that the Old Country cannot offer them opportunity, through no fault of their own. They are not work-shy; they are able fellows.

Here opportunity awaits them, and I am convinced that you will welcome all who come animated with that spirit ready to endure hardship as the old settlers endured it, for a time, and assured of brilliant success as I see so amply manifested around me. (Applause.)

The thanks of the meeting were tendered to the speaker by President Fennell of the Empire Club.

CONDITIONS IN BRITAIN AND EUROPE

AN ADDRESS BY HON. G. HOWARD FERGUSON, K.C., PRIME MINISTER OF ONTARIO

4th October, 1928

PRESIDENT FENNELL introduced the speaker, remarking that the Prime Minister of Ontario surely had not been in mind when the statement was made "a prophet is not without honour save in his own country," for the Prime Minister of Ontario is honoured, renowned and beloved in Ontario. (Applause.)

HON. PREMIER FERGUSON was received with loud applause, the audience rising and cheering, and he also ventured to quote Scripture—"Woe unto you when all men speak well of you." (Great Laughter.) He then proceeded to present a Union Jack to the Club on behalf of the Royal Empire Society; and then said:

What I have to say today will be the impressions I gathered from almost a kaleidoscopic view of the conditions in the countries I visited last summer. I lacked the time to make a very close study of conditions, yet even brief contact sometimes gives sound impressions. I visited France and Switzerland and spent some time in Germany, Denmark, Holland, Sweden and Norway in five weeks, so you will realize that my opportunities in any one country were limited.

Nobody can take even the most casual glance at the situation in Europe without being impressed with the outstanding progress that the German people are making. Everywhere you find thrift, industry, efficiency—on the farm, in the factory, in the store, on the street. Everybody is working at top speed, and Germany has practically no unemployment, or at any rate no unemployment problem. Bountiful crops are universal, and the German people have a different philosophy to what we have; they believe in hard work, while it seems to me the Anglo-Saxon peoples believe in escaping hard work.

Men, women and children in Germany work in fields practically from dawn until dark. They work long hours in the factories at very moderate wages. The cost of living is reasonably low, much lower than in Canada, and even lower than in Great Britain. A strong impression was left on my mind not only as to their industrial and agricultural development, but also as to the marvelous forestry schemes. There is not a waste acre on any farm that has not been planted and that is not producing wealth in the form of new forest; and one of the Ministers told me that their legislation requires that a man who owns a farm cannot cut the forest at will, but must make application to a branch of the Government which tells him what trees he may cut, because they regard timber as a great national asset that must be preserved for all time. So we can all take lessons from the Germans, not only in efficiency methods, in industrial activities, but in their outlook for the future expansion of their great nation. There is no doubt in my mind that within a reasonably short time the German people are going to say to the League of Nations, or some other organization that has a dominant voice in world affairs—"This hive is filled; we must swarm; we are entitled to go somewhere;" and this whole problem will be before the world's court again. What is to be done with the surplus German population and the surplus German products?

Denmark is a most interesting, though small, country. There they farm almost on the scale of kitchen gardens in places. I saw a farm of ten acres in Denmark on which a man was maintaining three cows, a couple of pigs and some hens, and a wife and three children, and was making a comfortable living. Of course up in Jutland you find some large estates, but Danish farms generally run from 25 to 50 acres, and in the intensively developed portions you find thrift and energy, and the ground well cultivated, fertilizers being used in great quantities, with the result that that little country which produces per capita its full share of the world's production gets 87 per cent. of that production from agriculture.

I wish I had time to tell you of some opportunities I had of closely studying the situation there.

I was interested in the Danish educational system, and I think that perhaps I picked up a thought or two that I may be able some time during the next fifteen or twenty years to weave into the educational system of the Province of Ontario. (Laughter and applause.) For some years I have been reading of the educational problems and conditions there, and I was struck with a type of school that is called "the People's School." I had the opportunity of spending a day at one of those schools, which is a sort of spirituelle enterprise. Those schools are private organizations subsidized by the Government. The pupils live entirely in them; for five months in the winter they take boys ranging from 17 to 22 years of age, and girls of similar age during the summer. They give them a little bit of academic training, but they emphasize history and literature; and they point with great pride to men like Grundtvig and the great confidence that he and others showed in the future for Denmark in the face of almost insurmountable odds, but they managed to draw together all the potential factors that make up one of the busiest little hives of activity in Europe today. Those pupils are impressed with a national consciousness, a pride of country, an emulation of the activities, and a breadth of vision and patriotism of the men who went before them.

Let me tell you just an incident. The portions of Denmark that came back under the settlement—Holstein and Schleswig—had been invaded very largely by the German people who, through their banking organizations, had been advancing money to the Danish peasants or farmers over a large area. Since the settlement they have been pinching the Danes and foreclosing upon their obligations, and in some cases driving them off their farms. A popular movement has arisen, with a propaganda to create a public opinion to support a popular subscription to pay off those obligations in the national interest. (Applause.) I was at a meeting held on a Sunday afternoon in a huge forest, attended by 2,000 people--men, women and children—and at the close of the meeting school girls were coming to the treasurer and having their money changed so that each and every one of them could make a contribution to relieve people of their own flesh and blood from the persecution of their enemies and to give them the opportunity to make progress and be good citizens in their own country. (Applause.) That is the type of patriotism that you find in Denmark. You find much the same conditions and spirit in Holland.

Unfortunately I did not have quite the same opportunity of seeing things in Norway as I did in Sweden; the weather was a bit against us. I was tremendously impressed with Sweden, not only its industrial development with paper, but its great forestry and metal industries, and its power expansion—three of the great outstanding features of its progress. But its people also impressed me. The style of living, the manner of carrying on their affairs, the personal contact that told me that the Swedish people had a spirit nearer akin to us than any people I found anywhere on the European continent—a splendid, thrifty, cleanly, progressive, intelligent people; and if I can do anything to induce the Swedes and other Scandanavian races to take part in the settlement and development of this country, I will feel that I have achieved something for the advancement of Canada. (Applause.)

Travelling there I was impressed with some of the fertile valleys of Sweden. Those of you who have been in France know how the average farmer there puts his buildings in a hollow square in which everybody faces the manure pile in the centre of that square, the aroma being equally divided between the residents, the animals and everyone who comes in. (Laughter.) In Switzerland the average farmer keeps his stock under the house—so as to keep him warm, I fancy. In Germany, except in the case of the progressive farmer, their buildings are great long structures, the family living in one end, the cattle in the centre, and the produce is kept in the other end. But up in Sweden the buildings are all separate and distinct, and I have never seen anywhere such uniformly splendid bank barns and such wonderfully well laid out farm operations as I found in Sweden. Something that put me to shame in regard to our own conditions here—and it is only a little thing—was that practically every farm building in Sweden is painted. (Hear, hear.) Almost universally they paint their buildings red, with white trimmings; and when you see those buildings with a surrounding of green forests all about, they form a marvellous spectacle of beauty and restful quiet, with evidence of thrifty conditions all around.

I went over to Norway for a little while, but unfortunately when I got up on the mountain the fog got there, too, and I had not an opportunity of seeing all that I would have liked. But I satisfied myself upon some things that I did see. One was that there is a surplus of population in Norway that can be well absorbed here. They are of a little different type from the Swedes. One would be almost amazed to find that two peoples living so closely together, having been part and parcel under one king for a century, should be so distinct in type. The difference is due to the difference in the character of the land and the different occupations that they follow; yet there are splendid industrious, thrifty Norwegians, that are looking for opportunities in a new land.

What the Norwegians need and what all Europe needs, and the British Isles also, if we are to get immigration, is more accurate and truthful stories about the conditions that exist in this country. (Hear, hear and applause.) In every country I was in I visited some transportation offices, and some I visited in Great Britain. I went in everywhere and asked for some literature about the Province of Ontario. Well, I found that some agents had never heard of such a place, and where I did get Canadian literature, the illustrations were entirely of life of the Western people such as my friend here, Mr. Bracken, represents—wheat fields, threshing operations, cattle ranches. In other words, there was not anything to indicate the diversity of opportunities that exists in Canada for people who want to come here. Well, I think we have taken some steps to cure that, even at the expense of the Province. (Applause.)

Then I turned my steps towards the centre and heart and inspiration of all things good and great—the British Empire—(Hear, hear and applause.)—and I am bound to say that when one gets back there, notwithstanding the deep impression of the beauties of mountains and streams and waterfall and field found in Europe, there is a matured, finished restfulness about the countryside in England, with their flowers and hedges and majestic old buildings, that is not to be found anywhere else in the world. (Hear, hear and applause.) And they are a people of a spirit and temperament and genius that in my opinion cannot be equalled anywhere in the world except possibly here in Ontario. (Laughter and applause.)

I had been in the British Isles three years ago, and of course I was interested in comparing present conditions with what I felt they were then. I was profoundly struck with the wonderful change in spirit, and improvement in organized business conditions that have come about in three years. It is almost incredible to one who has not had the opportunity of seeing it. Three years ago, as you recall, the whole social and labour situation was chaotic; employers with large investments were discouraged and depressed; transportation systems were practically broken down, people were seeking to evade the payment of their legitimate taxes, and that sort of thing, to enable them to live; wonderful historic old estates and establishments were being cut into small holdings because people could not afford to maintain them; a spirit almost of despair seemed to be abroad amongst the average citizenship in Britain. Today that whole situation has completely altered, and you find not only optimism and faith, but everywhere you find confidence that Britain has crossed the peak of the hill and is again on the highway to great progress and advancement. (Applause.)

Expressing my own view, which perhaps is not worth very much, particularly alongside of men who have to do with these things, I was inclined to think that because the British Isles had for centuries maintained a position of leadership I was going to say splendid isolation, at any rate an insular position—that she could go on for all time, sufficient unto herself, without looking beyond her boundaries for aid. The war rudely shook that out of their system. The whole revolution of economic and business conditions set the Englishman thinking; and he thinks slowly and deliberately but, best of all, he thinks sanely. It may take him some time to make up his mind, but when he has done so you may be sure that his judgment is based upon no selfish consideration, but upon broad, sound lines for the betterment of the world and the betterment of their nation as a whole. (Applause.)

Now, that situation was brought about by the shaking up of recognized economic principles—perhaps not principles but rules. Many new factors had entered into the problem. The ship building industry was badly shattered because after the close of the war there was a tremendous surplus of shipping that was bought at very low prices, so that the great shipbuilding yards of England, Scotland and Ireland suffered tremendously and to some extent are suffering yet. When I went into the shipyards of Harland & Wolff I was glad to hear the tap of the hammer from end to end of the place—thousands of men busily engaged, as they were in years gone by; and the future of the shipbuilding industry is assured to Britain as it always has been. (Hear, hear and applause.)

Then a situation developed in their coal fields. As you know, the use of oil in so many different departments of activity rendered the consumption of their coal much less. Besides that, coal mining in Britain is an expensive operation compared with what it is elsewhere. Old coal areas like the Forest of Dean and places of that kind are pretty well exhausted, and it costs a lot of money to get a ton of coal to the surface, and the quality of what they take out now is not always good; so that all this unemployment that has occurred in the coal industry is due very largely, to my mind, to what may be expressed in those few words.

Then another thing that none of us ever thought of played havoc with one of the leading industries of the British, and that was the development in the manufacture of artificial silk. That has given the Irish linen industry a blow from which I doubt if it will ever fully recover. It has hurt the cotton business of Lancashire mills. It had a tremendous effect on the employment of men and women in all those great enterprises. That situation has to be met and overcome.

Now, what are the remedies which Britain proposes? First, I remember hearing Mr. Baldwin, the Prime Minister, three years ago emphasize on the floor of the House of Commons, the greatest remedy that could be applied to their condition—that of research, investigation, the discovery of improved methods of manufacture, and the elimination of waste in their industrial life. (Hear, hear.) Let me tell you what Britain has done. In 1913 she spent $20,000 in research; last year she spent over $15,000,000—(Applause)—and she has today about 4,000 active professors, full-time students, and other experts working on investigations in universities and in private laboratories, seeing if new methods cannot be found to cheapen the cost of their products, to improve their quality, and to guarantee manufacturers the opportunity to maintain their place well up with the other nations of the world. In England, as in all progressive countries of the world, research is looked forward to to conquer some of the most difficult problems, and solve many of the difficulties that retard our progress here and in Great Britain.

Another thing they are doing or have to do—and it is a most difficult thing—is the transplanting of their population internally, because they have to systematically organize their attack upon their conditions, at least their methods of relief—internally, by research the movement of their population from one section to another, and they are undertaking in many places to move the population bodily, to try and educate them and train them to the adoption of new methods of employment. Now, Englishmen do not talk about these things. If this occurred in some other countries we could speak of there would be headlines in the press about the wonderful things the nation was doing—(Laughter)—but the Englishman just muddles along and gets through with it; and they are doing these things. They have training farms in England; I visited two of them and spent some time. They are taking boys who have been brought up in coal districts and know nothing about agriculture, and training them so that they can be put on the land. They are spending enormous sums of money trying to readjust their own situation within their own country, so as to be able to recover her position.

And then—and here I do not want to be charged with colouring my remarks with any political feeling—they have realized, as nearly all countries in the world have realized, and as all parties in this country have realized, that there are differences in economic, climatic, transportation and other conditions that exist between countries that can only be overcome by some sort of safeguarding or protection—you dare not call it protection in England. England realizes that if she wishes to maintain a decent standard for her workmen something must be done to keep the Czecho-Slavic and other people from driving them under the ropes. They have said, "Every industry that is basic to diversified development we will investigate, and if we think they need it, we will give them some protection under our safeguarding legislation." (Hear, hear and applause.) They have done that in the automobile industry, and it is marvellous what has been done over there in the manufacture of automobiles and in the rubber tire industry and others. Those are helping to take the place of other industries that had existed there for years but that have been forced to the wall by new conditions.

Then a word as to their outlook. Almost for the first time in history the British Isles are looking to the overseas portions of the Empire not only to send her people to, but to increase the process of binding that country up to our industrial activity and our commercial enterprise. Today in Britain we are no longer regarded as merely a storehouse from which to draw raw materials, but every portion of the Empire is recognized as a great potential factor in the development of the whole Empire. You find that statesmen and business men of every walk of life and of every party persuasion have a different outlook upon the future of imperial consolidation from what they had even three years ago. (Applause.) To my mind that is one of the healthiest signs that convinced me that this British Empire is just gathering herself, after this serious struggle, together again, and she will go ahead with greater force and greater success and greater influence in the world than she has ever had. (Applause.)

You know that Great Britain has established what is called the Empire Marketing Board, and they are devoting $5,000,000 a year to assist in improving production and methods of marketing not alone in Great Britain but in any part of the Empire. Where they think it will be possible to improve conditions over the whole Empire, or any portion of it, they are prepared out of that fund to spend dollar for dollar with the local interests. Today we have a contribution,—not large it is true, but it is an evidence of interest and good will—to help in some of our investigations at Guelph, that comes directly from the British Treasury as an evidence of their keen interest in our problems, and their desire to give us help. (Applause.)

If I had the time I would like to speak about migration, but I will say that there are plenty of possible migrants in Britain who are anxious and willing to come to a new portion of the Empire. Some of them have cauliflower ears and some of them have hair lips and some of them flat feet—a few here and there. We have fellows of that kind in this country—I see them everyday—and they get along splendidly; but unless we take the position that there shall be no more hair lips than what we ourselves have produced, of course we are going to discourage migration. Let us be sensible about it. (Hear, hear.) When we brought out those thousands of harvesters and told them, "You can work at the harvest during the summer, and if you can get a job for the rest of the winter you can stay in Canada", it was not necessary to ask them to answer more than half a dozen questions which meant, in effect, "Are you sound in wind and limb, and are you willing to work? If you are, you can go." Why, then, should we require four or five sheets of family history and technical statistics for the admission of immigrants? I would like to tell you, if time permitted, what effect that has had in the Old Country. I do not intend to say it in any partisan way, because I quite believe that when these things are brought home to the Department at Ottawa, as they have been, we are going to have an improvement in that situation; but I am interested in my country, and that is why I have ventured to say these things. (Hear, hear)

Let me tell you one little incident. A chap in a little village had decided to sign up to come with his family to Canada. He had to make two or three trips to see the doctor for examination. Finally he did not go. Now, that fellow occupied a rather important position in his own sphere of life, but, do you know, he became an object of derision; everybody pointed a finger at him, saying, "He was going to Canada, but they examined him; what was the matter with him? Why couldn't they take him? There is something wrong somewhere." That is an indication of the type of things that occur in the small communities there, just as they would happen here. There are a lot of little irritating things that could easily be removed, and I am quite sure that the Government at Ottawa, having had them brought to their notice, will see to it that they are remedied, and we will get our fair share of the magnificent type of young manhood that is waiting an opportunity to come out here and do their part in building up a home for themselves and helping us to develop this country. (Applause.)

Just one other thing. Britain has had to recover from the heaviest burden of debt, of taxation, of ruined industries, of loss of manhood, of any nation in the world. She has carried this burden uncomplainingly (Applause); has asked consideration at the hands of nobody and even insists on paying her debts to the people who would not forgive them anyway—(Laughter)—and yet in ten years what has she done? She has recovered her position to such an extent that she now has not only got a favourable balance of trade, but she has money to lend. (Hear, hear and applause.) Now, no nation in the world has ever done the like before. It is because of the quality and the spirit of the people. (Hear, hear and applause.)

Let me tell you one thing that happened while I was there this year. Ever since the war the railways were facing bankruptcy; the whole transportation system of those islands was breaking down on account of competition from busses and other causes, and through the falling off of traffic, because of depressed industry. There seemed to be no hope for the railways, but some heads of the labour organizations were called in and given an opportunity to examine the statements of the railways, to have them audited and to discuss them with the railway heads. Do you know what happened? The head of the labour organization said, "Well, there does not seem any other way of escape except to cut down the cost of operation. If you people who are managing these railways will cut your salaries we will cut our wages." Then they went out amongst the wage earners all over the British Isles, and came back to the management of the railways with a mandate to say that every workman was prepared to take 2½% less wages if the management would take 2½% less salary. That was accomplished, and the railway situation has been saved in Great Britain. (Loud applause.) You point to me any other country in the world with a spirit of that kind among its people—people who so truly love the flag, their constitution, their King, their whole political organization because they realize that it is the greatest that has ever been in the world—men who will make personal sacrifice at the expense of their own home comfort and pleasure to see to it that one of the fibres of national life shall not be worn out and broken, but shall be strengthened for all time to come. (Hear, hear.)

That, I say, is the reason that the Britisher is the greatest fellow in the world. He will provoke you beyond measure. (Laughter.) Time and time again you will want to knock the block off him—(Laughter)—but give him a little chance for thought, let him consider his problem carefully, and you will get justice—aye, and sound judgment—in any problem that he may undertake to solve for you. That is the reason that I love to call myself a Britisher. (Loud applause.) Coursing through the veins of all those people, our forebears, is a blood that is fortified by a wealth of tradition that gives them outlook and confidence, gives them genius that is to be found nowhere else that I know of in the wide universe. (Loud and continued applause.)

Rev. Dr. Cody expressed the thanks of the Club for the inspiring and informative address by one of the Empire's great constructive and originating statesmen.

A GILBERT AND SULLIVAN REPERTOIRE

SPEECH AND SONG BY MR. FREDERICK HOBBS AND THE D'OYLY CARTE OPERA COMPANY

11th October, 1928

The Crystal Ball-room in the King Edward Hotel was crowded with the largest audience that has assembled at any Club Luncheon this season, the adjoining room being required also, to accommodate the members and guests. The audience greatly enjoyed the proceedings—the speech of Mr. Hobbs and the singing of the Octette being applauded in the most enthusiastic manner—and joined in the chorus in some cases.

PRESIDENT FENNELL, in opening, said:— It is very significant that the Empire Club of Canada, organized as it is to strengthen every bond of Empire, should have as its guests of honour to-day the members of that famous Opera Company, the D'Oyly Carte Opera Company, who are presenting in Toronto this week the delightful operas of Gilbert and Sullivan. (Applause.) We in Toronto are very boastful and very proud of our English connections. We are very proud of most things English, but not more proud of anything English than of the English stage. No other stage has produced such playwrights. No other stage has produced such stars. No other stage has produced a Gilbert and Sullivan; and no other country has produced a D'Oyly Carte. (Hear, hear, and applause.) Gentlemen of the Company, you this week have made us very proud of our common tongue and our traditions. It is a very great privilege to have you with us to-day, and I have pleasure in asking Mr. Hobbs to introduce the Company. (Applause.)

MR. FREDERICK HOBBS, on rising, was received with loud applause, renewed again and again. He said:—Mr. President and gentlemen, when your very kind invitation to lunch with you was extended to the Company we were asked if we had any speakers, and we replied, emphatically "No." (Laughter.) We can produce singers who I think would be quite adequate to the occasion, but speakers, no; and it is quite unexpected on my part that I should be asked to stand up here and address you at all, but apparently some form of introduction is customary, so I will just call out the name of each member of the Company and ask him to stand, so that you will know which is which.

Mr. Hobbs then called each member of the Octette by name, and as the gentleman rose he was greeted with hearty applause. The following gentlemen responded to the call:— Messrs. J. Dean, T. P. Hughes, R. H. Jackson, Joseph Griffin, R. H. Jones, H. Aiken, R. Eaton, L. R. Flynn, H. Norris (Conductor).

Mr. Hobbs then continued: I should just like to say it is a great pleasure for us to be here to-day. During our last tour of Canada we were guests of various societies but I do not think we were ever the guests of the Empire Club, and I am not aware that there is another Empire Club in Canada. (Voices—"Yes, in Winnipeg.") Personally I am very proud to be present at a luncheon of the Empire Club. (Applause.) I was born under the Southern Cross, and I lived most of my life in the Old Country, but I have been in practically every part of the Empire, and lived and worked there for a great many months, and the matter of the Empire is very near and dear to me. At home I talk a great deal to the people about the Empire, and I think they are getting much more interested than they used to be. (Applause.) When I say "talk" I don't mean "speak." (Laughter.) The last time I was here the people said, "Go back to the Old Country and talk about Canada; we want the people there to know more about us and become more interested in us." I promised that I would, and really, gentlemen, I have almost had to apologize to some of my friends for the way I talk about Canada over there. (Hear, hear, and applause.)

Mr. Harry Norris, Conductor, then gave a delightful programme of songs and choruses, including the following, all of which were received with great enthusiasm:—

By the Octette—"Merriest Fellows are We," from the Gondoliers; "Who is Sylvia?" by Thomas Dunhill; "John Peel," arranged by Andrew, which was heartily encored; "Lullaby," by Percy Fletcher; "Zut, Zut," by Elgar, intended to illustrate a march in the mass.

By Mr. Hughes—"Song of the Flea," received with laughter and applause. By Mr. Jones—"Sparkling Eyes," from Gondoliers. By Mr. Griffin—"Because I was Shy," with encore, "The Young Maidens." By Mr. Aiken—"Passing By." By Mr. Flynn—"Past the Line." By Mr. Eaton—"Mollie Brannigan."

Mr. Norris, when a request came for the "Peer's Chorus," said, amid laughter, "It is rather difficult, and I think I might say that the best thing would be to hear it at the Show."

The delightful Recital was closed by Mr. Griffin singing, on special request, "The Englishman," from Pinafore, the audience joining in the chorus with the greatest enthusiasm. The applause was so loud and long that the song was repeated, the whole audience rising and joining in the chorus, and cheering.

Mr. George Wilson, President of the Board of Trade, voiced the thanks of the Club for what he called the magnificent treat that had been so thoroughly enjoyed. He considered it the high-light of this year of the Club. He referred specially to Mr. Norris, the good-natured and humorous Conductor, who was the soul and heart and inspiration of the great Company. While the delightful impressions made by the singing could not be fixed in cold type in the printed report, he had not doubt they would remain in the memories of all who had heard.

CANADA'S IMMIGRATION PROBLEMS

AN ADDRESS BY THE RIGHT HON. SIR THOMAS WHITE, K.C.M.G.

18th October, 1928

The subject upon which I have been invited to address you is "Canada's Immigration Problem". It is a subject in which there is widespread interest in Canada to-day. It is much talked of by our citizens. It is a topic of daily discussion in the editorial columns of the press. Chambers of Commerce, Boards of Trade, and other representative bodies pass frequent resolutions emphasizing the importance of immigration to the Dominion. The several Governments of the Dominion, Provincial as well as Federal, declare themselves as favourable to immigration, and claim to be putting forth their best efforts to increase its volume. Some of our publicists go so far as to assert that it is the biggest question before the Canadian people to-day, and that the supreme need of the Dominion at the moment is a larger population. It is not my intention to discuss controversial matters of administrative detail. The Minister of Immigration has a difficult task and any suggestion I may make is intended only to be helpful. My intention is to discuss only the broader national aspects of the problem. What is our present situation as to population? Do we need immigration, and, if so, upon what scale and of what kind? If we need immigration, from what sources shall we draw it, and what policies and measures should we adopt to effectuate the end we have in view?

What is our situation as to population? There is no doubt that the growth in population of Canada has been comparatively slow. It has not kept proportional pace with the growth of the Dominion in the other fields of our national life. Forty years ago it was five millions. In 1911 it was seven millions. To-day it is nine millions, probably a little more. Some claim that we are not retaining our natural increase notwithstanding our immigration. One naturally asks how it is that our production and our wealth have so enormously increased without corresponding increase in population. The main reason is, I think, the extent and richness of the natural resources of Canada which our railway expansion has opened up to development. Coupled with this is the extraordinary capability of the Canadian people. I remember the Hon. Mr. McAdoo asserting that per capita Canada was the most productive country in the world. In considering the slow growth in our population we must bear in mind that Canada is immediate neighbour to the United States. The attraction of opportunity in the Great Republic has always caused a considerable drain upon our population. This has been intensified by the quota system of restricted immigration enforced by the United States against the peoples of other continents, thus making the Republic a free market in a period of unexampled prosperity for Canadian labour and Canadian ability. This drain we have experienced from time to time in the past, and will likely continue to experience in greater or less degree dependent upon conditions on either side of the international boundary line. On the other hand half of our western settlers in the years immediately before the war came from the United States, and since the war Canadian business and industry have received great impetus from the investment of American capital aggregating three billion dollars.

It may be asked, as is indeed asked by some, why be so concerned about this matter of immigration? Canada is prospering to-day. Its people are enjoying a high degree of prosperity. Why not leave well enough alone. Why change the existing satisfactory situation by bringing in tens of thousands of new citizens who may disturb our labour conditions and bring about unemployment? The answer is that no one favours immigration of a character likely to bring about this result. We do not want wholesale, unrestricted immigration from all nations of the world. The immigration which Canada specially needs is an immigration which will become productive in the basic industries of the country. If we can broaden the base of our national production from the field, the forest and the mine, we shall surely strengthen and not weaken ourselves as a nation. For this not only producers but capital also is required. No one would seriously suggest an immigration policy whose object was merely to increase the population of our great cities. We must not forget that every newcomer who becomes a producer in these basic industries become a consumer as well. Production and consumption mean trade—increase of national wealth and industrial employment. If we increase basic production, industrial production will be automatically increased. Our employment will adapt itself to the enlarging situation. The greater our population engaged in productive industries, the greater the opportunity to retain the sons of Canada in diversified industry in Canada. Our first great problem after Confederation was to link the East and the West and thus join together the scattered parts of the Dominion. This was accomplished by the building of our transcontinental railway systems. Settlement followed and we now have a strip of population across the southern part of the Dominion. What we now need is to give depth to our population. The problem is to fill up our vacant spaces, to occupy our vacant stretches of agricultural lands. The national instinct of the Canadian people will hardly be satisfied until these spaces are populated and our other resources developed. This will, of course, take many decades to fully accomplish. To endeavour to accomplish it suddenly would result in national indigestion.

Assuming that there is accord as to the desirability of an active immigration policy, the question arises as to the kind of immigrant that will best serve the needs of Canada for population. Here there seems to be substantial agreement. We do not want people who through infirmity of body or mind are likely to become a charge on the community. We want those who are likely to succeed as Canadian citizens. We do not want anarchists. We want people who will be capable of assimilation—who will understand and appreciate our constitutional system of Government, and be able to play their part as citizens in building up the Dominion. We want industrious people. We want settlers for our vacant lands, of which we have still many millions of acres. I think the needs of Canada for immigrant skilled and unskilled workers will take care of themselves without specially aggressive effort. The real problem for Canada is to obtain settlers for our vacant areas of agricultural lands, and these are mainly in Western Canada —in the Prairie Provinces, the Peace River District and British Columbia. There is also room for many settlers in Northern Ontario and Quebec, and in the Maritime Provinces.

Where shall we find these new citizens for Canada? Naturally we turn first to the British Isles whose people are our kith and kin, of the same racial stock, and our fellow citizens of the British Empire of which we form so important a part. The Prime Minister stated in London last week that his Government welcomed with open arms men, women and children from Britain. He was on sound ground in making that declaration. It expressed the sentiment of the great body of the Canadian people. Canada put forth a prodigious effort to save the Empire in the great War. Canada is willing to co-operate in strengthening the Empire by helping to solve the problems of the peace. We must bear in mind that a citizen of the British Isles is not likely to enter upon the adventure of migrating, especially if he has a family, unless with the expectation of materially improving his condition. If he is to settle upon the land he must have some capital, either of his own of advanced to him, or he must be reasonably certain or obtaining work in the neighbourhood of his holding. He must be able to bridge time. His farm land must be broken. It will be a considerable time before it is sufficiently productive to maintain his family. In the meantime they must live. This is one of the obstacles to settlement in Canada to-day. The unemployed British citizen is in a favoured position as compared with those of last century. He has unemployment insurance. He has the old age pension. He may be out of work in Britain but he will not starve. It requires unusual courage and force of character to migrate and take chances in a new country. All this adds to the difficulty of our immigration problem so far as concerns Britain.

We know by experience that immigration from the Scandinavian countries is good. They are northern people like ourselves with some similarity of climate and somewhat of the same individualistic outlook on life. They and others of Northern Europe will make good settlers for our vacant agricultural stretches. I was pleased to hear the Prime Minister of Ontario say that he intended to give special attention to the matter of immigration from Denmark, Norway and Sweden. They are thrifty, industrious people, and they and their children will make good Canadian citizens.

Then what about the United States? Before the war about half of our yearly immigration was coming from that source. Tens of thousands of American farmers sold their high-priced lands in the middle and north-western States and migrated to Saskatchewan and Alberta to take up homesteads and low-priced lands. They were excellent settlers. They brought capital—were practical—knew precisely how to start and carry on their farming operations. During the war and the depression which followed many of these left the West and returned to the United States. There is evidence that this immigration from the United States is being renewed. If we examine the immigration returns for the years immediately preceding the war we find American immigration about half of the whole, British about 30 to 40%, and other nations the remainder.

This being the general view of the situation, the question arises, how can we increase the volume of desirable immigration? Much thought has been given to the subject by Governments, railway and transportatino executives, business organizations and citizens generally. I do not propose to criticize any of the schemes put forward. All have their merits. Some have advocated the spending of hundreds of millions by Canada in bringing in settlers from the British Isles, furnishing them with land equipped with cottages and farm buildings, loans to be repaid over a period of thirty or forty years at a low rate of interest. This would no doubt be effectual in obtaining settlers, but the cost of any such operation on a scale worth while would be very great. Take an expenditure of, say, $5,000 per family. To establish 50,000 families would cost $250,000,000. There is a further difficulty. Many of our own people in the East would say that they would like to take advantage of such a generous scheme, and it would be impossible to deny them the benefits we should be extending to settlers from abroad. All our Provinces would desire to be considered in locating these settlers. This would mean the buying of high-priced land. There is much merit in the plan of cheap passages, and particularly of bringing out boys and young men after a preliminary training in the rudiments of agriculture.

I have no doubt the railways will place many newcomers in the Peace River district under some system of assisted settlement scheme. If the British Government desires to finance community settlements in the West, Canada will, I am sure, be willing to co-operate in furnishing free land. But when all has been done the proposals made seem inadequate to give us the volume of immigration both Britain and Canada would like to see, except upon a basis of expenditure that has not yet been contemplated by the Imperial Government.

Is there any policy we can adopt to assist land settlement schemes of this kind? Let us examine into the conditions of our large volume immigration of the past. You will find it associated always with periods of vast railway construction. Even before Confederation you will find a large volume of immigration during the period of construction of the Grand Trunk, Great Western, and other Railway Companies. This construction meant work, expenditure of money on a huge scale. The intending settler could get part-time work on railway construction and gradually establish his family on the land. The ready cash enabled him to bridge time. He could sell timber for ties or bridges. You see the same process going on in Northern Ontario and Quebec, where the settlers in conjunction with their small farming operations sell spruce to the pulp and paper companies and ties to the railways. In this way they are able to partly support themselves and gain time to clear and cultivate their lands.

Now come to the period after Confederation. If you turn up the statistical records of immigration into Canada you will find that the most striking periods were in the eighties and early nineties of last century, and the first fifteen years of the present century. These were the periods of the construction of the C.P.R. and of the Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Pacific enterprises. During the period of construction of the C.P.R. one million immigrants came into Canada followed by a very considerable settlement in the Canadian North West. The C.P.R. construction, including branch-line construction, lasted into the nineties and for a few years afterwards there was little railway construction in Canada. The figures show that with the cessation of railway construction immigration also fell off, and we find a very thin stream indeed until the early years of the present century. But by this time railway construction was again in full swing. Mackenzie and Mann were carrying their line through from Winnipeg to Edmonton, afterwards to Vancouver. The Transcontinental Railway from Moncton to Winnipeg and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway from Winnipeg to Prince Rupert were under construction. These joint enterprises resulted in the expenditure of hundreds of millions of money in Canada. This capital was imported from Great Britain, that is to say, raised by the sale of securities of these Companies guaranteed by Governments of Canada. The Canadian Pacific during this period engaged also in a great deal of branch-line construction. What was the result on immigration? It was the greatest period of immigration in the history of Canada. From the beginning of the century to the outbreak of war Canada received in immigration over two and a half million people. The West went ahead by leaps and bounds. Homesteading, particularly in the vicinity of railway lines, was on an unprecedented scale. Settlement on the soil proceeded at a rapid pace. Western Canada was being populated by settlers who come attracted by the lure of free lands which they could make a home. Why was it that vast scale immigration synchronized with this enormous railway construction programme. Why was it that the eras of railway development in Canada were the eras in which we received the largest tides of immigration? It must be that we can look for immigration when times are particularly good—in boom periods so to speak, when those in other countries who have the courage to consider the question of migrating see a chance to advance their fortunes—to better their condition in the country to which they migrate.

We must keep in mind that there are two sides to the question. We may desire immigration from Britain or from other countries, but the other aspect is whether they will come. Are conditions such as to attract them if they are able to come, either on their own means or by assistance of Governments in paying part of their passage money? Unless they are confident that they will be able to obtain work to maintain themselves and their families they will not come. They should not come. No one would expect them to come.

Not only did the prospect of work attract immigration during the period of railway development, but that development made possible the settlement of the west and such settlements as we have in the north. Take the case of a British citizen who may desire to settle in the Canadian West as a farmer. You may give him a free grant of land or he may be able to buy some cheap land. But before his farm can possibly sustain him and his family he must break it—a long and expensive job

—must build houses and farm buildings, acquire teams and farm implements. How is he to live in the meantime? Railway construction and its allied activities gave him part-time employment. Thousands of settlers in Western Canada worked on railway construction, helped to build the tracks, stations, culverts, bridges throughout the West, or were employed in other activities to which railway construction gave rise. Villages, towns and cities sprang up. There was work, and work in proximity to the land which they settled. This work gave them ready money. They could bridge the time necessary to do their homestead duties, build their houses and add to their cultivation. Canada's land settlement owes much to the building of Canada's railway. There might be industrial activity in Eastern Canada. But men could not work there and settle in the West. The point is that there had to be work to give part-time employment, and it had to be in the vicinity of the land to be settled. What I have said about western settlement is true with regard to the settlements in northern Quebec and Ontario. The land itself for years will not give sustenance. The settler must supplement his work on the farm by work outside the farm, or by the sale of ties, timber, spruce to enterprises, railway or industrial, in this neighborhood. There is another point. The railways made settlement possible by giving access. Without the railways there could be no settlement of the land. The railways brought the lands of the West in touch with the markets of the world. In Canada we have had to build our railways in advance of settlement, otherwise we should have no settlement at all. Now what about the present situation? We are told that there are many overseas who desire to come to Canada. It is said that they would come if assured that they would be able to make a living or settle on the land. Most of them have little or no capital. The question arises, what are we to do with them after arrival? Many, no doubt, would be absorbed in our industries. We are in a very prosperous condition at the present time with very little unemployment in Canada today. But we feel that we need more basic production, more production from the soil. We agree that the most desirable settler is the settler on the land. All the provinces desire this class of immigration. I have pointed out that for Canada to stake these men until they succeed in agriculture alone would cost very large sums of money and, besides, presents many other difficulties. No doubt much can be done in that line. The British Government is prepared to spend considerable sums to promote land settlement beyond the seas. The Governments of Canada will no doubt co-operate to the extent they feel justified. But what will take the place of the railway construction in opening up new districts to cultivation and enabling the settler to earn money in part-time employment. No doubt we shall have considerable railway extension. Branch line construction will help. The tapping of the Peace River district has the earmarks of the old time development in the Northwest. I expect settlement to flow from this. The building of the Hudson Bay Railway will deepen settlement in Saskatchewan and Manitoba. Our mining development in northern Canada will attract workers for the mines. Personally, I should look forward to a fair flow of immigration due to these conditions.

But there is one kind of national activity which I believe will be more helpful than all these in promoting land settlement in Canada, and that is highway construction. The ties that bound together the East and West of Canada were physically speaking, railway ties. The cement that will bind them more closely together and every part of each of them to every other part, will be the cement of highway construction. Money spent on the construction of highways is not wasted. It is productive expenditure in the highest sense of the term. I well remember after the Armistice we were greatly concerned as to the conditions which might prevail in Canada due to the disorganization which must inevitaby result from the closing down of munition plants, cessation of ship-building, and other war industries, and the demobilization of Canada's citizen army. Many measures were enacted to meet these conditions, one being the Canada Highway Act, under which the Dominion Government distributed twenty million dollars among the provinces to aid in highway construction. I do not know of any measure which resulted in as good results for the money as that Bill. The 8000 miles of highway construction which has been completed in Canada since the War has, I believe, been one of the greatest factors in building up our prosperity. The tourist traffic alone which it has promoted has become one of our greatest sources of national wealth. It now exceeds three hundred millions yearly. It is only at the beginning, and what has promoted it more than anything else has been good roads in the various provinces. The motor car has transformed our daily life. Canadians own a million cars. In Canada it has been of particular value because it has annihilated distance. In the old days in the West it was essential that a settler should be close to the railways so as to be able to deliver his grain without undue expense. He also liked to be near to community centres both for the purpose of obtaining supplies and for social recreation. The motor has greatly enlarged the field within which settlement can be carried on. It has changed the character of conditions in the country. It has destroyed the isolation which was so disastrous in the experience of settlers in remote and thinly settled districts. But the motor depends upon good roads. There are thousands of miles of main and market roads still to be improved in our north and in the western provinces. The work in connection with this will be very considerable, involving the expenditure of millions of money. The maintenance will require labour. The improvement of these roads will mean the bringing under cultivation of increased areas of land. It will promote social activities among the settlers. It makes possible community life even in a sparsely settled district. It is gratifying to note that all the provinces are alive to the importance of the good roads movement. The question of finance is not too difficult because a large revenue can be derived from motor licences and the tax on gasoline. In the northern part of Quebec and Ontario, in the Prairie Provinces, in British Columbia—indeed in all the provinces, I know of nothing more likely to promote settlement on the land than the extension of good roads. It will take the place of the railway construction which I have mentioned. We must not only seek to obtain settlers but we must create the conditions here under which the settler can live and prosper after he comes to Canada. An enlarged programme of highway construction including the trans-Canada highway, carried on by the several Provincial Governments, or by them with the assistance of the Dominion Government, will, in my opinion, mean more to Canada in attracting, settling and retaining settlers of the needed kind than any other single measure which we can devise. Even if my view is over-optimistic in this we can suffer no loss from the improvement of our highways. All expenditures of this kind will be abundantly repaid by increased economy of marketing to our farmers, and of distribution in our business community, and the increase which will result to the tourist traffic. It is a case of expending money where the nation cannot lose, but must inevitably gain. It is my suggestion as one of the best means of aiding in the solution of Canada's immigration problem and at the same time of increasing the general prosperity of the Dominion.

ABOLISHING THE ARCTIC

AN ADDRESS BY VILHJALMUR STEFANSSON, M.A., LL.D.

25th October, 1928

PRESIDENT FENNELL introduced the speaker. DR. STEFANSSON was received with loud applause, and began with a reference to the death of his greatest benefactor in Canada, Sir Edmund Walker, and his older friend, Prof. Mavor, who first introduced Sir Edmund, who had joined Harvard University in financing the speaker's first trip to the Arctic in 1906, and given his constant support after that. In 1908 the Geological Survey of Canada, of which Mr. Reginald Brock was Director, joined the American Museum of Natural History in financing the second expedition, partly through the influence of Sir Edmund. That expedition continued for four and a half years, making six altogether inside the Arctic Circle. In 1913 Sir Edmund helped to influence the government of Sir Robert Borden to send out another expedition, which was five and a half years continuously in the Arctic; so that after eleven and a half years in the Arctic the speaker thought he was qualified to speak on the subject. He went on:

I think I might summarize some of the points I made in my address before this Club about ten years ago. They sounded then like pipe dreams. They continued to sound much that way even when I developed them next year into a series of articles in the "World's Work" Magazine. Six years ago, in 1922, they were published in book form, still with a visionary tinge, as most people saw them. (The address referred to is dated Nov. 11, 1918, and the book is called THE NORTHWARD COURSE OF EMPIRE).

The well-known slogan, "Westward the star of Empire takes its way", is only partially true, for civilization has been taking its way more consistently northward than westward for many thousands of years. In 2000 B.C.—4000 years ago—civilization was a narrow belt along the Tropic of Cancer east from Egypt and perhaps west too. Around 1000 B.C. the belt had extended down towards India and China. By the year one, this belt of civilization had extended into the subtropics and tropics of the western hemisphere centering around Yucatan. In the eastern hemisphere it had widened north into Crete and Greece and the Roman countries.

An Egyptian club 4000 years ago would have appreciated a luncheon speech congratulating Egypt upon its superior natural conditions—climate, soil, and position in relation to other countries. That ancient authority, Tacitus, said, "Who can conceive that any one, unless forced by stern necessity of war, will ever willingly go north of the Alps?" But it has come to pass that people do actually go to Paris by choice. (Laughter.)

Passing on to the time when the Moors were prominent in the civilization of the world, Draper, the historian, in his "Intellectual Development of Europe", tells us that there was a period when the stables of the Moors in Spain were not only better architecturally, but in some respects cleaner, than the palaces of the kings of England. The Moors were then in the habit of saying about the people of Great Britain, "They are only half civilized, and what else can you expect of a remote and clammy island on the very edge of the world? Their civilization is low now, and doubtless it will always remain so." But the Moors were eventually driven out of Spain and a Christian Armada of people who thought themselves more advanced than the British sailed north. But they never sailed back except as straggling and fugitive ships. Civilization, or at least the seat of military power, had passed far north beyond Rome or Spain, to England.

After a later war, when peace was being arranged in 1763 between Great Britain and France, and when sugar was just coming to be an important commercial product, Britain suggested to France that they might surrender the island of Guadaloupe. France replied, in substance, that they hated to give up this particular island for it contained valuable sugar and cocoa plantations, adding that they would much rather surrender Canada. To this the British replied, in effect, "Canada is big, but what is it good for? A few codfish on the Newfoundland banks, and a few furs, but on the whole not a valuable piece of property. We want a place with a climate in which people are willing to live. We want Guadaloupe".

The speaker had made no research to determine whether it was correct but he knew it was the ordinary view that Benjamin Franklin deserved credit for the point of view which eventually prevailed. This Bostonian and Philadelphian, usually considered the wisest or at least the shrewdest American of his generation, agreed with the British plenipotentiaries that Guadaloupe was worth more than Canada. "But," argued Franklin, "Guadaloupe is a distant island while Canada is contiguous territory. If we allow the power of France to grow up at our back door we shall have constant friction, with diplomatic squabbles and the potential seeds of another war." It was economically only, therefore, that Guadaloupe was the more valuable. For military and diplomatic reasons, Great Britain should accept Canada. And so they did accept it.

It is true that in the days of Franklin Canada was not the vast geographical expanse it now is, but instead only a comparatively small territory east of the Great Lakes. Even so, in the Canada of that day there have grown up cities of which Franklin never heard, the real estate in which is worth more than the entire island of Guadaloupe. (Applause.)

When the United States purchased Alaska in 1867, paying $7,200,000, it did not apparently occur to anyone, even Seward, who did the bargaining that the territory was worth it. Three schools of historians, represented by Channing, Rhodes, and Woodrow Wilson, have advanced theories as to why the United States bought Alaska, but none of those theories considers the possibility that the land or even the seas adjacent might be valuable. The Alaska Purchase was apparently nothing but a political deal to repay Russia for having held the Spaniards in check on the western coast of America during the war between the States. Now that vast territory is known to have rich values in minerals, forests and grass. The rivers have their values too, and the seas roundabout. In 1919, for instance, salmon was only one of the fish cultivated. The sockeye was only one of the many kinds of salmon. Of the sockeye only a part was canned, yet the portion that was canned was sold that year for $23,500,000, more than three times the original price of Alaska.

Those who want to rebut these arguments may say in reply that, true enough, it is a little curious that Tacitus could not foresee the coming greatness of France and Germany, that the Moors did not foresee the dawning power of Britain, nor Franklin the value of Canada, nor Seward the value of Alaska, still it is a long lane that has no turning and that perhaps we have come to the turning point now. But we have shown that in every millenium of the past the centres of wealth and power have been found farther north than they were a thousand years before. The burden of proof rests upon those who now try to prove that the course of history is about to reverse itself, so that the centres of power will stop moving northward.

We hear it frequently said that Canada has a bad climate.

When the Puritans left England, some went to Massachusetts and some to the West Indies. The latter were said to be going to the better climate. But the descendants of those who went to Massachusetts became the backbone of the American nation while those who went to the tropical islands became poor white trash. (Laughter.)

After the war of 1776-83 some people of the American colonies went south into the tropical islands again, and some went north into the Maritime Provinces and other parts of Eastern Canada. Again history repeated itself; those who went north have been prominent, and if you are descended from them you will say they are the backbone of the Canadian nation, while those who went south became white trash and disappeared.

The point is, there are two kinds of good climate; there is a good loafing climate and a good working climate. (Laughter and applause.) I suggest that it is not a good climate where bananas and yams flourish if men decay. Canada, excepting Victoria, B.C., has a working rather than a loafing climate. (Hear, hear, and applause.)

In the United States no city has a worse climate, in the opinion of the country as a whole, or in that of her residents, than Chicago. It is bad in nature, and bad on account of the smoke nuisance which they permit. Yet, in spite of that, and in spite of the gales which blow stiff and cold from Lake Michigan, Chicago is one of the great cities of the world, and growing rapidly. The climate seems to have no effect on her growth. If you are willing to live in Chicago you will be willing to live in Winnipeg if your earning power is as good. Winnipeg is therefore fast becoming the Chicago of the Canadian west, and growing soundly and normally. But the type of people who would move from Chicago to Winnipeg would move from Winnipeg to Great Bear Lake if they thought it would pay them, even though the winter is a month or two longer. Whether they are willing to move there depends in part on how they are informed, or misinformed, about the Far North.

In 1906, when journeying down the Mackenzie River, I met Elihu Stewart, then head of the Forestry Service of Canada—I think he was a resident of Collingwood, Ontario. He published later a report describing trees 100 feet high, growing straight and beautiful, north of the Arctic Circle. The Government published that report. Ten years after, the Ontario Department of Education approved of the use in the Public School of a book which said, in substance, that so severe was the climate on Great Bear Lake that trees no more than six feet high and no bigger round than your wrist required hundreds of years to grow. They left it at that, with an apparent desire to prove that the Bear Lake territory is terrifying rather than inviting. The fact is that on every shore of Great Bear Lake, north as well as south, there are trees 100 feet high that grow in dense forests, so that you have to clear your way between the trees with a hatchet as you walk.

Do you think it is any real advantage to Ontario that the Northwest Territories shall be so misrepresented in your text books ?

As late as ten years ago, every series of school geographies in common use in the United States said that "North of the Arctic Circle it is always cold" (except one or two which said, "North of the Arctic Circle it is never warm"—they gave you that much choice). (Laughter.) In a little campaign which I started against these text books at that time I pointed out, among other things, that John Davis, after whom the Davis Straits are named, had reported as early as the days of Queen Elizabeth and William Shakespeare that he had observed in the Arctic on some occasions weather as salubrious as any he had seen in the Cape Verde Islands, and that the United States Weather Bureau, more than a decade before the geographies in question were published, had commenced reporting from its Arctic station at Fort Yukon, Alaska, temperatures of 80, 90, and even 100 degrees in the shade. I suggested that unless they wanted to keep the whole Arctic as imaginary as its leading imaginary tenant, Santa Claus, the Americans had better take some steps to bring their text books into conformity with the information in which William Shakespeare and Queen Elizabeth believed three hundred years ago and in which their Weather Bureau believes today.

I am particularly glad to repeat this to an Empire Club audience, for I notice with great satisfaction the presence of my old friend, Sir Frederick Stupart, head of the Dominion Weather Service, who is so honest that even in an attempt to shield me he would not be able to keep from looking disturbed if he did not know that what I am saying is in strict accord with the facts.

The discrepancy between the six foot trees of Great Bear Lake as represented in the Ontario text books and the hundred foot trees found even a hundred miles north of that lake as described in reports of the Forest Service, was no isolated case. Moreover, there seemed to be in the south people who preferred to believe whatever they could that was evil and terrible about the north. At first I did not understand this or see any rhyme or reason for it, but I think I understand it now through analogy to a phase of United States history which I have been studying recently.

Canada today is a settled fringe along the northern frontiers of the United States, just as the United States, 150 years ago, was a settled fringe along the western shores of the Atlantic. As late as 1800 the wealth of the United States was as nearly centered in the east as Canadian wealth was in the south in 1900. Around 1800 it began to be said in Massachusetts and Virginia that you could raise bigger crops on land you could get for nothing out around the Mississippi River than you could on land which you would have to buy near Boston or Richmond. Previously a farmer had divided his land between the elder and younger sons or tried to provide the young with the means of buying an adjoining farm. Now the younger son, if he was not going to the city, was likely to pack up and cross the Alleghenies. This meant one man less to buy groceries at the village store, a team of horses less to be shod by the local blacksmith, one customer less to bid up the price of real estate. It seemed obvious then that anybody was an enemy of the local community who spread abroad news of how good and cheap the land was on the Mississippi or the Ohio. There resulted a hatred of anybody who spoke well of the west and an indiscriminate charging of everyone with being a liar as well as a public enemy who praised the west.

Running the west down was even raised to the level of statesmanship. There was a real danger, apparently, that colonies planted too far beyond the Alleghenies might grow into independent states, possibly hostile to the Atlantic States. This was indeed more than a possibility as we see from reading the history of that day, and as we can easily realize if we remember that telegraphs, telephones, railways, automobiles, and good roads in the modern sense were not only unattained but undreamed of. Zebulon Pike, for instance, after whom Pike's Peak is named, thought himself to be doing a public service when he put into his official government report of a journey beyond the Mississippi a statement to the effect that many Americans had been afraid that the United States would expand too fast, but that, by the grace of God, there was no danger of it, since he had found himself after crossing the Mississippi in the heart of a great desert. Thus was invented, rather than discovered, the Great American Desert which attained the proportions of what it was called, the American Sahara, and leaped at once into the textbooks of every community east of the Alleghenies that was anxious to curb the westward march of the pioneer.

Other statesmen joined Zebulon Pike as, for instance, the one who reported to the United States Army that there was scarcely a blade of grass in the vast triangle within the forks of the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers.

Two accidents dispelled the Great American Desert. The first, historically, was the development of the sect of Mormons who became so unpopular that they had to flee the east, and who were so wisely led by Brigham Young and others that they marched across the plains states into the real desert of the inter-mountain section where, through irrigation, they established the blossoming communities of Utah.

The second accident, later but more important, was the discovery of gold in California, and the almost insane rush towards that El Dorado by the Forty-niners.

We have not as yet had the good fortune of developing in southern Canada any religious sect or other group so unpopular that they have been driven north to help dispel the Arctic desert of Canada. But we are having a good fortune analagous to the gold rush of '49. For nothing that has so far happened in Canada has done so much to dispel the myths of the north as the rich discoveries of minerals in Northern Ontario and Northern Manitoba.

I said a moment ago that I was glad to talk about Arctic weather in the presence of Sir Frederick Stupart, the man who knows more about Canadian temperatures than anyone else living. I am no less glad to state what I believe about the myth-dispelling power of the recent northern mineral developments in the presence of that Jack Hammell, who seems to deserve a more important individual place in them than any one man ever deserved in the western gold development of '49.

Next to mines in bringing the North into its own, and co-ordinated with it, is flying. If an airplane wants to fly from a great city in the United States west of New York to a great city in Europe it must fly over Canada to follow the safest as well as the shortest route. From Chicago to Stockholm, for instance, your line of flight runs through Cochrane, Ontario, and across Northern Labrador. Hassell and Cramer were real pioneers last summer when they opened that shortest and safest of routes to Europe.

In flying from Seattle or Vancouver to Berlin you actually fly across Canada north of Hudson Bay. If you are Paris bound you fly over Hudson Bay and Iceland, entering Britain by way of the Orkney Islands and Scotland.

Several great cities of the United States can save anything from 500 to 2,000 miles by flying over Canada on their way to Europe. That is bound to locate in Canada eventually many important way-stations for the aerial services of the United States and of Europe. We also have great cities of our own with their developing needs of swift commerce. They have an important advantage over cities in the United States through being nearer Europe by the Arctic flying routes, for those are safer as well as shorter routes.

When I spoke of a few of these things to you in this room ten years ago they sounded visionary. Now I am afraid they sound very ordinary. Ten years from now they will sound like an incomplete rather than inaccurate report of things done and already surpassed. (Loud applause.)

HON. MR. JUSTICE RIDDELL expressed the hearty thanks of the Club to the speaker for his informative and interesting address.

PATRIOTISM AND POETRY

AN ADDRESS BY SIR HAROLD E. BOULTON, BART., C.B.E., M.V.O., M.A., ETC.

1st November, 1928.

PRESIDENT FENNELL introduced the speaker, who was received with hearty applause, and said: I am obliged to begin this conversation by quoting a very old tag: "Let me make the songs of a nation, and let who will make its laws." This remark was made by a very wise old Scotsman somewhere in the fifteenth century, and it is not so ridiculous or so unpractical as the light-thinking modern man might at first sight think. You must remember that when the remark was made there was no press; means of communication were very difficult; and how were the sentiments of a people to pass from one part of the community to another, and to reach those in high quarters, except through the ballad-mongers and the song-singers? That is why that remark is full of profundity; and I hope to make you believe today that although in the days of modern society it is not quite so true as it was then, there is a certain amount of truth in it, yet.

I can go back, and I hope I do not bore you too much in reminding you that the Spartans, in the days of their greatest prosperity, and their greatest warlike efforts, were always inspired by a particular bard whose name was Tyrtaeus, who wrote their national songs, who went into battle with them, and who led them to victory.

There is in the British Museum a long poem—indeed a ballad of forty-two verses, with music complete, a fine-sounding tune, which was the tune that Tallifer, the bard of William the Conqueror, sang to the victorious troops at the battle of Hastings. He went with William the Conqueror into the battle singing this tremendous song, and it so happened that he was killed in the battle. So, all the way through history, we find songs that have had a tremendous effect upon the times in which they were sung or produced. Might I remind you that in a later age Sir Philip Sidney said that when he wanted to feel like a brave soldier and go into battle the ballad, "Chevy Chase" was to him like a trumpet-call.

There is another song called the "Ribald Laird," a skit on James the Second of England and the Seventh of Scotland, and which had more to do with driving that king off his throne than anything else. It is a wonderful old tune. The reason we do not use the song now is that it is so full of contemporary political allusions that it does not appeal to us.

I need hardly remind you of the tremendous effect upon history the "Marsellaise" has had. That magnificent tune, with the stirring words, has probably caused more bloodshed than any one knows. It has inspired people to go into war and into revolutions more than any tune you can possibly think of. That is a modern instance.

Now, what I should like to get at is, how this affects the modern Canadian tunes. Well, I suppose everybody in this room has an enthusiasm for some tune which comes from England, Scotland, Ireland or Wales. those old countries, which just brings the lump to his throat at times. I expect that some of you have a mixed history to look back upon, and you may be the inheritor, perhaps, of more than the tunes of England and Scotland, Ireland and Wales. Well, you have a great heritage there, and whether they be battle-tunes or not—of course they are not all battle-tunes—they do appeal to your consciousness, and they do rouse you up to higher thoughts from your ordinary life; and some day or other, when Canada is a hundred years older, it will have a tremendous line of national tunes which will take their places. Personally I expect all of you have a certain kindness for some of those great tunes from the Old Country, and they have had perhaps more effect on your life than you realize at first sight.

I will just run over those four countries—England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales—as briefly as I can.

I have spoken of the song that was sung at the battle of Hastings. There is a very beautiful old tune of an anniversary thought commemorating the battle of Agincourt. Then when you come to a later period in England, of which I am now talking, you find that the sea-songs are supreme. At the time of Nelson you find old songs like "Hearts of Oak" and "Ye Mariners of England" and "The Bay of Biscay" and "Tom Bowling." Such songs at that time kept up popular enthusiasm. It is a curious thing to note, in this connection, that there seems to be no great song about the Duke of Wellington. Neither is there about the Duke of Marlborough. I think the reason is that after the Armada was taken the army was not big enough, and the British people, as a whole, thought about themselves very much more as a naval power than as a military power. So there is no song about Wellington, and the only song about Marlborough is a French skit, sung to the tune of "He's a Jolly Good Fellow"("Marlborough et son Guerre.")

The English sea-songs are pre-eminent. To come down to modern history. If anyone thinks of the late war nobody remembers anything that is very likely to live; that is, as far as I know. There is "Tipperary," and a beautiful song called "Roses of Picardy"; but I suppose that now society is so complex, and the war was such a horrible thing, that finally no light-hearted lyrical writer that knows anything about it could really write anything. It is too horrible for words, and for musical words. Perhaps that is the reason we have nothing about it.

Well, of course our patriotism is not only affected by martial songs, but all the sweet, genial country songs like "The Pale-faced Daughter of Arlington," and songs of the towns, like "Sally in our Alley," and there are splendid songs you all know which certainly have an effect upon our lives.

Now I pass very quickly to Scotland, which has really more wealth of song than England. It is purely owing to the fact that it is divided into different compartments, which are no longer water-tight, but once were; that is, the Highlands and Lowlands. You have the Lowlands, which have been longer subjected to modern civilization, where you have beautiful songs like "Annie Laurie" and "Jock o' Hazeldean" and "Jessie, the Flower of Dumblane," and all sorts of songs like that. Then you have the really stirring songs of the Highlands, such as "A Chlanna Chuinn Cuimhnichibh" (Harlaw), "The Emigrant's Lament," and hundreds of others of which I could tell you. You have those two separate compartments producing an infinite amount of lovely melodies. Then you have a sort of combination of the two when you get a tune like "Scots Wha Ha'e," which is pervaded somewhat with the keen Celtic fervour, and yet has got the more Anglo-Saxon southern lilt in it. It is a song that must have had a tremendous effect upon people in the tartan kilt. You have that song at every St. Andrew's gathering every year, and can note the effect when it is sung; and I think that every Englishman, when he hears "Scots Wha Ha'e" properly sung, is glad that his ancestors were beaten at Bannockburn. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) Then the other great song that everybody has cribbed is "Auld Lang Syne." All over the English-speaking world you find people spoiling the beautiful Scotch Doric of Burns with the English accent, and singing "Old Lang Syne." I think that is a good instance where knowledge of song occasionally has a part in one's ordinary life.

With regard to Ireland, there is a tremendous wealth of beautiful melodies. Many of them have not been put yet to Anglo-Saxon words, and therefore we do not know about them. Of course at the beginning of the nineteenth century there was Thomas Moore, the Irish poet, and he wrote many things that this audience knows, like "The Minstrel Boy" and "The Harp that Once through Tara's Hall," and later on there are one or two quite modern ones. I dare say you know that beautiful air, "Mavourneen"; that was quite a modern one (Lady Dufferin) which shows that they are still able to have songs that are modern. "The Wearing of the Green" was written quite in the middle of the nineteenth century, and I have been told that Queen Victoria loved to listen to that song, as well as to her favourite Scottish Jacobite songs—of which I could talk to you for half an hour—although both abused the House of Hanover for all they were worth. (Laughter.)

Now Wales remains. Wales had not really very much striking music, as you would think from the place they occupy at the front of the stage in the musical world, because the truth of it is that they are the best executants of music in the British Isles. (Hear, hear.) Every Welshman can sing and take part in a song without seeing any music, and does so at once. And they have kept on that wonderful old British festival which is now known in English as the Eistedfodd. It is because they are the best executants that they have kept music alive, but I do not think they have so many notable tunes as you get out of England, Scotland and Ireland.

Now, this is something we have to thank the Welsh for, that not only in Great Britain but in Canada and other parts of the Empire they have kept the national festivals. The Eistedfodd has not only been taken up in other parts of Great Britain, but owing to the foresight of the Canadian Pacific Railway and other people here, you are now getting a series of festivals—your French Festival in Quebec, the Scottish Festival at Banff, an English Festival at Halifax, and there is to be a Sea-song Festival at Vancouver, and so on. National song is to be kept alive in that way, by copying the Welsh in the way they conduct their festivals; so that we owe a debt of gratitude to them.

With regard to Canada itself, of course, I should have said that you have got all those backgrounds to go upon—England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales—for moulds, until you are old enough to have a national song and music of your own. But there is one great factor

I think I might mention, that is, the extraordinary and illimitable wealth of the French-Canadian songs. It is only lately, if I might say it with due deference, that the English-speaking Canadian has had any knowledge of the immense wealth of the French folk-song and folk literatures of the French-Canadians. Indeed they have the richest inheritance. Long before the Anglo-Saxon became a Canadian the French were here, and in the three hundred years they have been here they have preserved the beautiful old French songs which they brought with them, and they have also in these three hundred years created quite a lot of very excellent French-Canadian songs—logging songs, love songs, and so on—which are quite good folk-songs, and they have been long enough here to have good folk-songs of their own, apart from what they brought from France.

In view of this background of English, Irish, Scotch, Welsh and French-Canadian song, it is obvious that the dream I have often had will be realized, of a really Canadian School of Music. (Applause.)

You have already one or two very good English-speaking Canadian composers—I will not mention names, because it would be invidious to do so. There are one or two very good French composers, and some day or other they will create a School of Music for Canada. I want to make this point: in a really national music the more sophisticated action like opera or symphonies, or anything you like, to be really national, must be founded upon the folk-song of the country which it represents. All the best national music must draw its own inspiration from its own proper background. In this connection you have only to think of Mozart, Strauss, Beethoven, Maskagni, and so on.

Now, the English-speaking national music of Canada has not got very far. It is interesting that its beginnings are inextricably mixed up with French Canada; and this is as it should be. In the first French-Canadian song we really know—"Row, Brothers, Row, the Stream

Runs Fast"—the words were written by our Anglo-Irish poet, Thomas Moore, and the music was, of course, a French-Canadian tune. I am going to pass over the "Maple Leaf"—which is Anglo-Saxon, or English, or Scotch, or whatever you like to call it—and come on to "O Canada." Now, the tune of "O Canada," which was written by a French-Canadian in 1880, is, to my mind, the most splendid tune, almost, in the world; I think it is equal to the "Marseillaise." (Applause.) Now, that splendid tune was first written by a French-Canadian; he then got a French-Canadian poet to write the words to it. Of course there have been various translations. Well, the French-Canadian poet was reflecting French Canada in 1880, therefore those words are not of much use to us now, even in the English translation. There have been many attempts to make a proper song to go to that irregular tune, and I do not think we have quite arrived at it yet; but some day that will occur. But you have there one of the most splendid melodies in the world.

Then to speak of the imperial field. Recollect what Canada is going to do in the future. Having a National School of Music—which of course you must have, for you are a virile nation, and must have a Music School of your own—there is no reason why Canada and South Africa and Australia and New Zealand and India, and other parts of the Empire, should not themselves conceive the almost impossible dream of a great Imperial School of Music. Think of the poet and the composer who are going to write the really imperial song! Now, when that song has been written I shall certainly be gathered to my fathers with as much content as you will go about your business when I tell you that this is the end of my address. (Laughter and loud applause.)

Prof. Wrong expressed the thanks of the Club to the speaker for his interesting address.

FRANCE AND CANADA

AN ADDRESS BY DR. PAUL CLAUDEL, D.S.P., LL.D., FRENCH AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES.

8th November, 1928.

PRESIDENT FENNELL introduced the speaker, who had just received the degree of LL.D. from Toronto University, and was received with hearty applause, the audience rising and giving three cheers. He said : When I arrived in Toronto the President gave me a small slip of paper on which I read the programme of my time, and I saw, "8th November, one o'clock. Lunch at the Empire Club." I should have been delighted to lunch at the Empire Club and meet so many distinguished citizens of Toronto, if I had not read, under those lines, another line of sinister import—"The Ambassador is expected to make an address." (Laughter.)

Well, I know that in America—and I suppose in Canada also—everything begins by an address, which is a token of friendship; but I am greatly hindered by two things. I see on my table a book which is called, "Addresses to the Empire Club," and in that book I see such speeches as apply to the Welfare of Canada, the Situation in China, and so on, and I am perfectly unable to treat you with such heavy meals as these. (Laughter.) Moreover, I have to address you in a language which is not mine, which I read all my life, but which I speak, as you see, in a very imperfect manner. But my preparation is such that if I make mistakes you will say, "Oh, well, that poor man speaks badly, but, after all, it is not his own language." So I can make many more mistakes than if I spoke our language. (Laughter.) However, we will have great pleasure to see practically how much better English sounds in another mouth than the French Ambassador in Washington. (Laughter.)

As you know, as Ambassador I have to assist at many social functions, and to have conversations with the lady at my right and the lady at my left. Generally those conversations are very interesting indeed—they are not always (Laughter) but when I have a neighbour and see that the conversation is languishing, sometimes I see a sparkle in her eye, and know she has a good subject, and she turns to me and says, with that sly and meaning smile, "Well, Mr. Ambassador, I hear that you are not only an Ambassador, but you are a poet, too." (Laughter), and I am obliged to confess that this is true. I have a high work, but always have with me a very unfortunate and sometimes annoying companion, which is a poet, and I am slightly ashamed of such failing. (Laughter.) But I may say I am less ashamed in Canada than in any other country.

My friend Moline was a poet with a special talent, and when he was asked what made poets he said, "What makes poetry is white paper." (Laughter.) That is exactly what was told by a Japanese poet of one thousand years ago, who wrote a very charming book, for that simple reason that the Emperor had given to him a bigger bundle of white paper, and that inspired him every day to write what came to his mind, and it made one of the most charming books of Japanese poetry. After all, "Poetry" comes from a Greek work which means "to make," so Poetry is the art of making something out of nothing. (Laughter.)

I cannot help but think that the same gift of white paper which is given to poets was given also to Canada by the Creator. Canada is a country with big white paper of tremendous possibilities, and I think it is what is most inspiring in your beautiful country. It is not only to think of the past, which is so glorious, and the present, which is so grand and impressive, but also of the future, which is so full of inspiration. I think that Canada is only at the beginning of its glorious and splendid career.

I am especially pleased to think that the particular nation which keeps such a strong individuality, and which has such a special vocation as Canada, has as one of its most necessary ingredients the French elements, our French-Canadians, which are the best of friends of Canada, the strongest partizans of Empire, and the truest subjects of His Majesty the King. (Hear, hear, and applause.)

As a Frenchman I feel specially gratified to be among you on the day when the poppy of Flanders is sold everywhere in your streets. I have one myself—not outside, but inside—(Laughter)—and I feel that one of the strongest ties between the different parts of that big concern, the British Empire, was sealed in France. (Applause.) The soil of France was the place where all the parts of the British Empire centered as one, because they fought for a common ideal and on a common field. The union of all the parts of the British Empire was seen on French soil; they were to be for ever friends and brothers. (Applause.)

My only ambition as a Frenchman, as a brother of your countrymen in Canada, is to ask you to never consider our French, either in Canada or in France, as foreigners, and to always consider them as people who are accustomed to see in each other the best friends of our common country. (Applause.)

It is a great privilege to be today among you. I am on the last day of my trip to Canada. I could not conclude it better than in this fine city of Toronto, which I learned to admire during my term of office. I am much obliged to my friend, Mr. Massey, who is such a credit to Canada, and so many friends in Washington, who invited me specially to come to Toronto, and who told me that I would find here many friends of myself and of my country—(Applause)—and I see, by your kind recognition, that it is only the truth; and I hope, if I have another opportunity to come to Canada, to find myself again among my good friends of Toronto. I thank you. (Loud applause.)

SIR ROBERT FALCONER voiced the thanks of the Club to the speaker for his fraternal and interesting address.

OUR TRADE CHANNELS

AN ADDRESS BY WILLIAM H. MOORE, LL.D.
CHAIRMAN ADVISORY BOARD ON TARIFF AND TAXATION.

15th November, 1928.

PRESIDENT FENNELL introduced the speaker, who said : I know you are interested in other matters than those affecting the Empire, but I have a suspicion that most of your speakers have talked about phases of Empire concern. You know all about the Empire; what then can I say ? Your invitation, I take it, was extended to me as Chairman of the Tariff Board, and presumably you wanted to know something about the work of the Tariff Board. That work has to do with evidence bearing upon the customs schedules. The tariff is a means of creating trade channels through the Empire and elsewhere, so, after all, if I talk about matters with which you are familiar, my excuse is your invitation.

Our trade channels are many and long, extending as they do, to nearly every land on the earth. To be exact, to ninety-five countries. They go back to Confederation, and within the time at my disposal, I have thought to confine myself to a rough sketch of the more important changes that have taken place in the trade channels of this country since the foundation of the Empire Club. The more I looked into the subject, the more it seemed to me I had found a good starting point. Your Club can hardly be called a venerable institution. I object to being called an old man and I remember quite well the foundation of the Club. Looking back, not quite twenty-five years, one sees that things have happened to our external trade that might have been expected only in the land of Oz, or some other country under the influence of magic.

All of us have lived through that period and we have taken these remarkable things as a matter of course.

I suppose that is the way of the world. Europe had its Dark Ages and yet, I fancy that people who lived then did not realize they were living in a dark age. Britain had its Industrial Revolution and fròm the reading of the times one can but conclude that few people then realized that things were being done that would turn the industrial world upside down.

When the Empire Club was founded in 1903, the foreign trade of this country amounted to, roughly, $450,000,000 a year, and last year it amounted to $2,298,000,000. You will observe that I have left off the hundreds of thousands. Indeed, I shall try as far as possible not to burden you with figures, certainly not with exact figures. Some political arithmetic is necessary, but only with the idea of tracing growth and change.

Now, I would stress upon you that the headway of a country is not to be measured solely by the figures of its foreign trade. You know that, and I know that, but sometimes it seems to have been forgotten by those who talk and write upon the subject. Canada has an external trade as great as the United States had when it had seventy millions of people.

I have an idea that somebody is thinking that our external trade has not really increased five or six times in the past twenty-five years. It is money value that has increased. When allowance is made for the changing value of the dollar, the increase will be found to be much less. There is, of course, a substantial something in the thought, but we have learned at the Tariff Board that trade is not to be measured by the average buying power of the dollar. Some of our commodities have declined in value; some have increased, and to get exact measurement, it is necessary to know the specific commodities which are to be valued, and their relative importance in the trade of the country.

Our difficulties of comparison are further increased by the coming of new commodities which twenty-five years ago had no value, because they were not then in existence. I offer the radio as an illustration, and you will readily think of other illustrations.

Our foreign trade for 1926 amounted to $241 per capita. An amount so surprising that it needs an explanation. I wonder if there is anything in industrial inheritance ? We were beaten only by New Zealand with $321. Australia came very close to us with $228. Certainly the Motherland gave us a pace with a per capita trade of $190. Now these figures are only remarkable by way of comparison. The United States had a per capita trade of $77 during the same year. During the recent election Mr. Hoover thought the foreign trade of the United States a remarkable achievement. And it is. Ours is simply more remarkable. British people have followed the example of wise old Solomon who with Hiram built a navy and searched the seas for trade.

There is, of course, a further and more substantial explanation of our great per capita foreign trade as compared with that of the United States. I should not refer to it were it not so evidently forgotten by those who are wont to make comparisons between the two countries.

Our southern boundary is the northern boundary of the United States. Their southern boundary is the northern boundary of Mexico. Uncle Sam has one foot in the cotton belt and the other in the wheat belt. He is fortunate in possessing materials which all countries to industrial pretensions require. The United States is probably more completely supplied with materials for modern industrialization than any country in the world. And yet, it is not quite an industrial world within itself. There is scarcely an industry for which some material must not be imported. And the increasing complications of industry have led to increased dependence. The United States is dependent upon others in this day of universal dependence. Canada is more dependent upon foreign materials than the United States.

Yes, we have to dip south for many a thing that is produced only in the South, and it is only a partial satisfaction that the United States has to come to us for its nickel and its asbestos and several of the materials it requires.

We are dependent, but our dependence is not always to be taken as an evidence of weakness. Curiously enough, it may be a sign of strength. I doubt that many of us are wearing clothes made from wool produced in Canada, and inquiring for the reason in a Tariff Board investigation, we were told that our farmers found other things more profitable. We were told at the Tariff Board that the growing of flax and the making of linen was an industry natural to this country. When the evidence was all presented it appeared that we could grow flax of a fibre suitable for the making of linen, but it also appeared that our farmers were unwilling to undertake its cultivation, for the cultivation and harvesting of flax out of which linens are made are laborious back-bending tasks.

Men will never agree of the effects of trade channels upon national character. Many a controversy has been fought over the subject. Personally, I never felt that my nationality was going to be affected by the hat I wore.

Whatever the effect of trade channels may be, it is exceedingly important that we should bear their trend in mind. When your Empire Club was formed we traded with the United Kingdom to the value of $184,000,000 and after twenty four years, that trade is worth more than $600,000,000. A substantial increase you say. Wait. In 1903 our trade with the United States was almost $200,000,000, and twenty-four years later one billion, one hundred and fifty million. Now these figures have been brought to your attention very often. Perhaps, none of our national sums is so much discussed and indeed they deserve discussion. These figures are of national concern; of Empire concern. These figures indicate the trend of our main channels of trade and tell us with no uncertain voice that while we are trading more extensively with the United Kingdom than we did in 1903 we are trading still more extensively with the

United States. True it is, that trade with our sister nations of the British Empire has increased from 16,000,000 in 1903 to 137,000,000 in 1927, and to have the real picture of the Empire trade, these figures should be added to those of the United Kingdom.

What is the explanation ? We are not going to switch more trade to the United Kingdom and sister nations by simply bemoaning that our trade within the Empire has not developed in harmony with our desires. The reasons are to be found not by alone examining trade figures with Great Britain. I suggest that they are to be had better by looking over our trade account with the United States, and we must do it, item by item, and take all the items. I have not the time to do that today. I have time to give you only a suggestion as to the direction of the inquiry.

I hesitate to blame the members of the Empire Club for our American trend of trade, but the facts have it that the word automobile crept into our tariff schedule during the very year the Club was formed, and the automobile is in part responsible for our new era. The automobile came a few years before, but the statisticians apparently did not know what to do with it. Sometimes they thought it a buggy or a wagon, and at other times an engine. It was both. None of us were quite sure that it had come to stay. However, it came and left a deep impression upon industrial, social and national life.

The automobile came from the United States. It might have come from the United Kingdom. When Watt took out inventor's patents for the steam engine in 1782, he wrote with uncertainty in his papers that it "might be applied to give motion to wheel vehicles." And it was so applied. In 1833 there were said to be at least twenty coaches operating around London upon their own power, and dozens of companies were formed fro the purpose of operating self-propelled vehicles. Most of you are familiar with what happened to prevent the motor vehicle from taking the highway. The highway or turnpikes were then owned by private companies who had also stage rights and, through their influence, was passed the famous Locomotive Act in 1836, in which the British Parliament taxed the steam vehicle out of business, and that the job be well done, stipulated a man with a red flag to walk ahead of steam coaches on the highway to warn the people of their approach.

However, the Englishmen did not do too badly out of their legislation. The steam engine took to rails, and without the railway we should not have opened our great plains in the West. In fact, we should not have had the modern world.

I should not have strayed away from my subject. The fact I am trying to bring home is that the automobiles came to us from the United States and brought with it a score of industries that contributed a huge volume to our external trade. You may think I am placing undue stress upon the automobile industry, in a talk upon our trade channels. If you think that, then think more carefully. The automobile industry gave rise to what may be called "The chain or progressive system" of assembling materials. It brought about in the true sense of the word what we know as "mass production," so often confused with large scale production. Out of that method of production came a rule that to the strong belongs the market.

Survey the newer industries that have been established in this country. Most of them are American industrial derivatives. They began as assembling plants, and out of them Canada had at first but limited advantage. When they had developed to a size where they could absorb the cost of making designs, the dies, the machinery, and the tools which were required in the production of parts, they then passed to a further stage of production, and Canada had greater benefits.

The matter is essentially technical. Perhaps I may describe my meaning by illustration. Some months ago I had occasion to visit a clock factory; a branch of an American concern, located in a Canadian city. One was struck, upon entering the factory, with the orderly manner in which the parts were assembled in their crudest form at one end of the building and came out at the other a clock that chimed, and I presume, kept fairly accurately the time. There was little machinery in that particular room, and I asked the foreman, "Where do you obtain your parts. Do you bring them in from the United States?" "We used to bring many of them from the United States," he replied. "Now they are all made in Canada, with the exception of the hands of the clock. Those we import from the United States, because the machine with which they are made would turn out in three months more hands than could be used in Canada in the course of a year."

There, I suggest, you have a picture of mass production. There, you have an explanation of why so many of the Canadian industries working under modern methods of production desire to import materials which are not raw materials, but are semi-manufactured, and are in reality the finished products of other manufacturers.

Our increased trade with the United States is not to be accounted for wholly by a desire of American capitalists to work in this country for the sake of the home market.

For seventy-five years we have been making paper in Canada, but before the foundation of the Empire Club, we made it almost exclusively for our own use, then came Mutt and Jeff and Andrew Gump, and the demand for week-end publications. Our statisticians tell us that it takes 100 h.p. to produce a ton of paper. Fortunately the power is generally located near the woods and so our pulp and paper industry grew, and the exports to the United States grew until they overshadowed the domestic requirements and one hundred million dollars or more were added each year to that new volume of trade about which I am talking today.

And while I am speaking of hydro electric power, may I remind you that this is an electrical age and that our development of electrical power has played its part in the development of our external trade. My time is too limited to give you many examples, but I ought to refer to the aluminum industry. It will illustrate why you hear so little today about a phrase that used to be handed around pretty frequently, exotic industries. Down in British Guiana there are huge commercial deposits of a substance called bauxite. The application of electrical power is required before it can be converted into something useful. Investigation revealed that bauxite could be shipped to Canada and turned into aluminum beside a Canadian waterfall, and so at Arvida a great industry has been established. The interest is owned mainly in the United States, although we are told at the Tariff Board that Canadians have holdings in the company, and have almost from the beginning had a substantial hand in its direction.

Thus we are building the country's trade channels. Now I wonder if that is quite an accurate expression. When we use the phrase "the country's trade" we mean, of course, your trade; the trade of individuals. We mean the industry of the men who have the investments in industry and its direction.

What can a country do to direct the channels of trade ? I assume that I am not trespassing upon dangerous ground. "What should we do ?" may be a matter of controversy. What we can and cannot do is a matter of record. All Canadians would build Canada; none would destroy it; all would have its industries and resources developed. Our differences are only as to the means and the sacrifices, and their incidences.

The markets in which we buy our materials out of which to create goods for export, would appear to be beyond our effective control. When a manufacturer says, "I am going to compete with the world, I must buy my materials wherever I can buy them best," Parliament has said the request was a reasonable one. The principle of giving drawbacks upon duties paid upon materials that enter into the export trade is generally accepted. No one questions the advisability of its application to raw materials that are not produced in this country, but its application to semi-manufactured materials has bedevilled our old ideas of tariff making.

Let me give you illustration. We have a considerable export trade in rubber tires. Last year it amounted to $18,000,000. Now, of course, rubber tires are made only partly out of rubber. We may import our rubber from the East Indies or the British possessions, for within the Empire, fortunately, there is to be had the major part of the world's supply of rubber. A curious situation, the United States is the greatest user of rubber and depends upon Great Britain for its supply; the United Kingdom is a large buyer of cotton and depends mainly upon the United States for its supply of raw material. Perhaps a fortunate mutual dependence.

When the tire manufacturers of Canada require materials, they may or may not require raw cotton. Some of them spin their own cotton and some of them buy cotton fabrics and, being entitled to a drawback when they place their orders with Canadian manufacturers they place that portion of their needs for export at about United States prices. There is no blame to be attached to anyone in the transaction. The need is inevitable, but the effect is that the Canadian makers of these cotton fabrics have not, by any means, the full application of the duty upon their output. That is why I say our tariff items must be scrutinized in order to understand their bearings.

The country has some control over the course of its export trade, and that control is exercised by treaties mainly with other countries of the Empire. A British content of materials and labour is required.

At its last session, Parliament gave the Government of Canada power to raise that British content, with the idea of encouraging trade within the Empire.

All Canadians, I repeat, would build industrial Canada and I like to think that all Canadians would extend its channels of trade throughout the Empire. But the making of channels is not a simple matter. Someone at Geneva figured out the other day that there are a million commodities in use under modern civilization. Under our Canadian Customs schedule, we have three separate classifications—the British Preferential, the

Intermediate and the General rates. I am not suggesting that Parliament has to consider in its tariff three million separate items, but it has to make provision for all of them.

How then can the Parliament of Canada and the Parliaments of the Nations within the British Empire make their tariffs to encourage trade within the Empire ?

You will recall that before the war broke out, there came to Canada a Dominion's Royal Commission, bent upon investigating the resources of the British Empire with the design that there should be built up, as far as possible, trade within the Empire. The war disturbed the work of that Commission and delayed its report. That delay emphasized the need of other means of action, and that means has taken the form of creating Tariff Boards—Australia has a Tariff Board, and so has India. The United Kingdom has had a number of Commissions under its Safe-guarding of Industries Act. We learn from the press that they are to be converted into a permanent institution.

The work of the Board at Ottawa is only in its inception. The Board has yet to win its place among the institutions of Government. We of the Tariff Board, as you know, are not under the Civil Service. We are not judges. We hold our positions by virtue of Order-in-Council, and conduct only those investigations referred to us by the Minister of Finance. I do not say that by way of complaint. Within two years we have had from him one hundred and sixteen references. I may tell you frankly they have taxed our capacity to investigate. Our Board is a fact-finding body. When an industry comes before us there is invariably opposition and that is the genius of the Board. The strength of a good case is brought out by opposition; a weak case goes by the board; but it is Parliament decides what is strong and what is weak.

It may be that some of you think our duties are too wide; others may think them not wide enough. Time will tell which is right. We have had criticism, and we shall have more criticism, and only by constructive criticism will the Tariff Board grow into greater usefulness.

We have had co-operation, and such success as we have had has been due to the co-operation of the farmers, the consumers and the manufacturers, represented by organized bodies. They have sat around our table and disagreed, but have disagreed as earnest men anxious to find truth. Our Board table does not yet resemble the peace and harmony of a Thanksgiving dinner when someone says "After you the choice cuts."

We have the co-operation of the press, for which I express my sincere thanks. Publication of the notices of hearings was essential to success and the newspapers have published these notices gladly and without remuneration.

It may be that I exaggerate the importance of our work and the bearing it has upon Imperial channels of commerce; I doubt it. There is sentiment in trade, but blind men do not build wisely, no matter the stoutness of their hearts. Different portions of the Empire cannot build to a common plan without knowing what each can do and is prepared to do. That knowledge we seek to give; that knowledge is being given to us by other Tariff Boards in other parts of the Empire. We are doing a work which will some day lead to an industrial structure within the Empire that is built to plan; that is permanent.

MAJOR NORSWORTHY, Past-President of the Canadian Club, voiced the thanks of the audience to the speaker.

THE OLD ROMANCE IN CANADA

AN ADDRESS BY JOHN NELSON, ESQ.
HEAD OF DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC RELATIONS, SUN LIFE
ASSURANCE COMPANY OF CANADA.

22nd November, 1928.

MR. CLAUDE A. C. JENNINGS, Vice-President of the Club, introduced the speaker, who was received with hearty applause, and said :—We have been rather preoccupied in Canada, of late, regarding our status, although even our leaders seem unable to agree upon a definition of it. In some sections we have been developing an exaggerated national self-consciousness, which magnifies our own merits and depreciates the part other nations have had in shaping our destiny. We have been more insistent possibly in demanding recognition for ourselves, than generous in granting it to others. That is, perhaps, natural in a nation just conscious of having reached man's estate. But, when a young man sets up housekeeping for himself, he often recalls or fully appreciates for the first time the debt that he owes to those of former generations. So today, instead of following the popular practice of dwelling on our own achievements, I prefer, if you will allow me, to recall some services rendered us by other races—services too often forgotten by us—and to mention some debts due them which we should acknowledge, even if we cannot pay.

In doing so, I am conscious of no disloyalty to my native land. An undue pride in ourselves, and a low appreciation of other peoples does not make, as some vehement folk seem to think, for a robust and intelligent patriotism. Our good neighbours to the South are frequently embarrassed and crippled in their relations with foreign powers through the distorted ideas acquired on this false basis by some of their own people regarding the facts of history. He is no true friend of Canada who would wish to bring such an affliction upon this country. Our self-respect will never suffer by gratefully acknowledging our obligations. At a Pan-American conference some years ago, a South American statesman, who had been chided for not endorsing the enthusiastic claims of some of his colleagues, declared: "I am not wanting in affection and love for America. I am, rather, wanting in distrust and ingratitude toward Europe." That sentiment and that attitude, applied to Canada, is one that it would be well if we all adopted.

In casting up our national account, the first debt that we find is, curiously enough, to a continent of which we think as having come only recently into our orbit. I refer to Asia. In the fifteenth century India was already opulent, and caravans and caravels brought her riches, for trade via Asia Minor and the Mediterranean to the more primitive states of Europe. When that trade was cut off by Turkish conquests in Europe, it was the enterprise of Portuguese navigators that discovered the old fabled route to the East by the Cape of Good Hope. Their success fired the ambition of Columbus to seek another, and a Western route. The result was, as your great townsman, the late Goldwin Smith, once pointed out, that this continent was discovered by a man who staked everything on the belief that no such continent existed, and that the western way to India was open by the sea. Columbus died believing that San Salvador was an outpost of Asia. Similarly, the Cabots expected to find no land between Bristol and China, and literally tripped over Newfoundland. Francis the First spoke of the discoveries of Jacques Cartier as "the extremities of Asia toward the West." So that it was the existence of a rich and cultured Asia, and the quest for it, that unexpectedly resulted in the discovery of America and Canada.

Had no such motive existed, and had no such enterprise been shown by Spaniard or Portuguese, our discovery might have been deferred for many years, might have fallen to the sailors of other lands, and the whole course of history might have been altered. In such an event, the chairman of today's meeting, to adopt the language of Gilbert and Sullivan, "might have been a Roosian, or French, or Turk, or Proosian, or perhaps I-tal-i-an."

Somewhere in the national balance sheet, therefore, there is a substantial credit to the joint account of East Indian, Turk, Portuguese, and Spaniard.

For if Asia furnished the motive, southwestern Europe furnished the men. That should chasten the frantic boast and foolish word in which our claim of Nordic superiority is so often couched. It was not men of our race, but Latins, who gave Columbus and Verrazano and Magellan and other great pioneer navigators to the world and to these waters. Similarly in warfare, Persians, Egyptians, Romans, Greeks and other Mediterranean peoples were conquerors of the known world before our Teuton ancestors became dominant. It is the beginning of wisdom for us, therefore, as Canadians, and as a race, to walk humbly and to remember that among civilized races there are no inferior peoples—only backward ones—and these are largely the result of time and circumstance. It possibly might temper the harshness of our immigration regulations to recognize in the unwelcome Oriental, the possible representative of a coming super-nation. Even the humble immigrant from Southern Europe still personifies to a degree the glory that once was Greece, or Portugal, or Spain.

We more readily recognize and concede our debt to England and to France. It has become trite to say that we derive from them our language, our laws, our literature, our freedom and our faith.

Occasionally we are rather cynically reminded that we inherited their feuds as well. This applies to the whole continent, as well as to Canada. The early French and English wars in North America; the revolutionary war; the war of 1812—all had their origins in or were the backwash of European quarrels. Even the American Civil War—nominally a domestic struggle—had some of its roots in a trade in the bodies of Africans introduced to America by Europeans, for it was the

Spaniards who inaugurated the slave trade. During the Crimean war, British and French gunboats bombarded forts in Behring Sea. At the outbreak of the Great War, the sea raiders of the Hun threatened both our coasts. This new continent has seldom failed to share, directly or indirectly, the quarrels of the old.

Our fortunes have been involved with those of Europe and of the Motherland in various forgotten ways. Had it not been for European wars, British Dominions in North America would doubtless have included Alaska, Washington and Oregon, and Louisiana—all three empires in extent. Britain was eager to buy Alaska from Russia, but the resentment of the latter country over the Crimean war led its ambassador in Washington to conduct hurried and almost feverish negotiations, which proved successful, for its sale to the United States.

Sir Alex. Mackenzie, after he had crossed this continent overland (the first white man to make such journey, north of Mexico) laid before the Home Government the most imperial project in which Canada was ever involved. It contemplated a fusion, under the Government, of the Hudson's Bay Company, the North West Company and the South Sea Company, with vessels in both the Atlantic and the Pacific; with a chain of fur trading posts from Hudson's Bay to Vancouver Island, and with fur marts not only in London and Montreal, but in Canton. The whole gigantic project, as far as the Pacific was concerned, was to be dominated from a military and naval base at Nootka, on Vancouver Island, and with smaller stations at Astoria in Oregon, and on Queen Charlotte Islands. Britain was then too preoccupied in a death struggle with Napoleon to act upon the suggestion, and before she was in a position to do so, Lewis and Clark had descended the Columbia to its mouth, and fixed the destiny of Washington and Oregon under another flag.

Louisiana was lost through a characteristically shrewd move on the part of the United States. The American ambassador in London had expressed his uneasiness at the conduct of the French Intendant of Louisiana. The British Minister, with what seems like unnecessary candour, assured him he need have no anxiety, because war between England and France was about to break out, in which case the British would immediately take possession of Louisiana, and as the United States would then have Britain as a neighbour and friend, they need have no more apprehensions. The United States Minister in London at once notified his brother ambassador in Paris, who in turn promptly communicated information to the French government, and urged the sale of Louisiana to the United States, to prevent such a rich territory from falling into the hands of the dreaded English—an argument that proved quickly effective.

Remembering these circumstances, it is probably within the mark to say that the Motherland paid a larger price potentially on this continent to break the power of the little Corsican than even in Europe, where in addition to bearing the brunt of the fighting with the enemy, she had to finance her allies.

Interesting as were these epochal events, they are excelled in interest by what might have happened on this continent—but didn't. Had Britain adhered to her original purpose of moving the United Empire Loyalists to Australia instead of Canada, it is unlikely that this country would exist today as a political unit. Certainly Ontario would not have been under the flag which now hangs behind the President's chair.

Russia, but for Britain, would probably have been as powerfully entrenched on this continent as she is in Europe and Asia. During the very years that the Motherland was finding asylum in this province for the Loyalists, Russia was sending political convicts to penal settlements in Alaska, and using knout, gallows, and firing squad there, the same as in Siberia. She proposed to enslave the Japanese in Alaska, and the remains of huge barracks for that purpose may still be seen on Japonsky Island. She planned to wrest the whole west coast from the Spaniards, as far south as Mexico. The

Crimean war, and the roar of guns from British battleships off her forts in Behring Sea, shattered that illusion, and before the war ended, she approached the United States for the sale of her great empire in America. Hence had it not been for one of Britain's wars in Europe—a war for which she is often criticized—Victoria and Vancouver might have been fortified outposts of the Bear, and California a soviet state. If such a condition had obtained, some worried Canadians who are now losing sleep over our status as a free and independent state in an equally free and powerful galaxy of nations, might have had something really substantial on which to base their fears.

I mention these to show how involved national bookkeeping can become, and how hard it sometimes is to determine on which side of the ledger the entry should be made.

If we have suffered because of European feuds, don't let us forget that we have benefitted, and benefitted enormously, from the same cause.

One of our most unctious boasts is that for more than a hundred years we have lived at peace with our neighbours, the invisible boundary line between us unmarked by a single fortress and unvexed by the bark of a single gun. That is a proper subject for gratification, but not for invidious comparison. I recently heard a Canadian Minister of the Crown refer to it as an object lesson to Europe. Our Prime Minister, speaking the other day in the capital of France, while wisely refraining from a similar comment, cited it as an example of how international difficulties could be composed without recourse to arms. But neither England nor France—our two Mother states—need such an object lesson. Although traditional, almost natural enemies, they have been at peace as long as we have. Even were that not so, it doesn't mean, as we sometimes seek to imply, some natural superiority over less enlightened and more warlike folk in Europe. It is due not to our moral virtues so much as to physical facts. Where countries are too small for the natural expansion of their people, as is often the case in Europe, war, at least under the old conceptions, was almost inevitable. Thus confined, countries become mutually menacing, and the laws of self-preservation cause the powerful to subdue the weak. But if we pause to recall the names of the treaties which determined the boundaries and extent of our North American nations, we are reminded that to some extent it was the fights in which these Europeans broke their bodies that made possible our long unbroken peace. Their valour, to a great degree, gave us these vast areas, which allow the energies of our people free exercise without impinging on the dominion of other states. Thanks to the possession of that spacious heritage, the combative and conquering traits of the Anglo-Saxon found a readier outlet on this continent in subduing the wilderness and overcoming the forces of nature than in fighting his fellow man. Had Europe been similarly circumstanced, Europe would probably have been similarly peaceful.

Several years before the Great War, and shortly before his death, Arnold White, the British naval writer, told me of a conversation he had with the Kaiser of Germany. He enjoyed the friendship of the Emperor and is said to have been the only Englishman permitted to put to sea in a German warship. They were breakfasting together, and the Kaiser said: "White, I never wake in the morning without wondering whether or not foreign troops have crossed my frontiers in the night." Such an attitude of mind, luminous as it is in explaining some causes of the war, would be inconceivable and even ludicrous on this continent. We have so much room that we can relinquish a piece of Labrador bigger than an old-world kingdom, without a belligerent headline in a single Canadian newspaper. But let us not forget that this almost illimitable heritage, held so easily by us in peace, was bought with the red blood of our race. And little of it was Canadian blood, though had our land been threatened in the last hundred years, we should, quickly have disproved, as we did in the Great War the barbaric theory that the virility and courage of a race can be maintained only by frequent exercise in war. But instead of being smug about it let us gratefully attribute our peaceful state in large measure to forgotten generations of nameless heroes in the British Isles:

Who, century after century, held their farms,
And looking out to watch the changing sky
Heard, as we heard, the rumours and alarms
Of war at hand, and danger pressing nigh;

Yet heard the news, and went discouraged home,
And brooded by the fire with heavy mind,
With such dumb loving of the Berkshire loam
As breaks the dumb hearts of the English kind,

Then sadly rose, and left their well-loved Downs,
And so by ship to sea, and knew no more
The fields of home, the byres, the market towns,
And the dear outline of the English shore;

But knew the misery of the soaking trench,
The freezing in the rigging, the despair
In the revolting second of the wrench
When the blind soul is flung upon the air.

And died (uncouthly most) in foreign lands
For some idea, but dimly understood,
Of an English city never built by hands
Which love of England prompted and made good.

It is that city "dimly understood" by them—that overseas state only vaguely visualized by them—of which we today are the privileged citizens. And it is due at least as much to their valour as to our vigilance or virtue that Canada is not only a wide land but a peaceful one.

Another, and priceless heritage from our own ancestors, is our instinct for freedom.

England did not always excel her continental rivals in war, nor navigation, nor culture. But in her fight for liberty, she never flagged and became the beacon light of Europe. Other mediaeval states achieved liberty before her and lost it. England never accepted chains.

That boon she transmitted to her overseas children. And if occasionally through the inexperience or ineptness of her rulers she was led astray in her treatment of her younger dominions, from the principles she had long practised, it was the lessons her daughters had learned from England herself that enabled them to maintain their rights.

After all, where such misunderstandings arose, it was often more an error of head than of heart. There is the best evidence of that fact. The two greatest factors in maintaining here the British tradition, and in preserving Canada's national identity have been the French Canadians and the United Empire Loyalists. One is the direct result of England's magnanimous treatment of the French at the Conquest; the other, resentment by the Loyalists over their harsh treatment by the Government of the new republic after the revolution. Britain's conduct is the more wonderful when we remember how daring a departure it was from the traditional and accepted method of that day in the treatment of conquered peoples. The action of the United States is the more surprising following a revolution where so much had been suffered in the name of justice and liberty. So when Canadians feel disposed to cavil over minor misunderstandings, it is well to recall that the most priceless and enlightened precedent of all history in the treatment of conquered enemies—a milestone in the recognition of human rights by the conqueror—was established on this continent, not by any New World power, but by that venerable old world nation that we still feel justified in calling the "Mother of Liberty."

In the story of Canada, one of the most significant things is the way in which varied, and often antagonistic forces have contributed and sometimes converged to mould our national form. Men of various races strove with one another for mastery, but often achieved more in their defeat than they could have secured by victory. Take the strange case of Radisson. Born in France, he came as a lad to Three Rivers. While hunting with two other boys in the woods, he was captured by the Iroquois. His companions were scalped. His own life was spared through the intervention of an old Indian and his wife who adopted him. There he lived the life of a savage, and linked the lore of the woods to the quicker intellect of the white. He finally escaped to Quebec and laid the foundation of the fur trade, for his were the first white paddles to break the waters of Lake Superior. When he brought a valuable cargo of furs to the Rock, as Quebec was called, most of it was confiscated by a covetous governor. Angry and disgusted, he turned his back on his country and, aided by the merchants in Boston, voyaged to Hudson's Bay. Later he went to London and told his story to Charles the Second, and to the picturesque cavalry leader of the Restoration, Prince Rupert. Together they founded the Hudson's Bay Company.

On the ship which took Radisson to the Bay, was a young street urchin of London, Henry Kelsey. One can picture the wonder and awe with which, on that voyage, the street-bred lad watched the great hunter and voyageur with his panther-like tread so suggestive of the carpetted aisles of the woods. When posts were established on the Bay, the boy deserted and went to live among the wild tribes who traded there. He soon became more expert than his savage tutors in the ways of the wilds. He pushed back and back from the Bay till one afternoon, when August was on all the hills, he came out on the prairies—the first white man to behold that marvellous sight—the great lumbering mass of buffalo darkening the plain. He later became a factor, and helped to establish the dominance of the great Company over that Empire of the North, which we often forget has been under British rule longer than any other part of Canada.

Thus fate, which so often mocks the plans of men, decreed that a Frenchman, trained by hostile Indians who preyed upon his country; rejected by his own countrymen; encouraged by New Englanders, enemies of New France; and finally in co-operation with Englishmen, traditional enemies of his race, with a street lad from London, should lay the foundations of British rule in a large and vital section of Canada, and thereby really make possible this Confederation.

The case of Radisson is typical of the colourful and seemingly contradictory factors which make up the Old Romance in Canada. Its stage is crowded with people of all nations—Latin and Teuton, Saxon and Gaul, Slav and even Mongol. They bear all kinds of symbols —paddle and pen, sword and crucifix. They belong to five centuries.

In the deeper background stands a high minded young prince of Portugal, Henry, who dedicated his life to the spread of geographical knowledge and sent out his navigators with the injunction, "Learn to do nobly." Then, inspired by their example, Columbus at the court of Ferdinand, trading an idea for the Queen's jewels. Queen Bess waving her hand from the window of her court at Greenwich, to acknowledge the Royal salute of Martin Frobisher, as he drifted down the Thames with three little vessels, bound for the unknown. Radisson in buckskin jacket and moccasins, talking before the fire in St. James' Palace of the Canadian wilderness, with Prince Rupert in lace and ruffles, and with sword on hip—the king of the coureurs de bois and the prince of cavaliers. Verendrye, lying sick of soul and body at Fort Reine, where Portage la Prairie now stands, while his sons, turned back broken hearted, after seeing the snow on the Rockies beyond which, they knew, lay that western sea which they had so long sought. Wolfe, quoting the Elegy as he entered the boat that was to carry him up to the Cove—and to his death. Champlain in his tepee in the heart of the Huron wilderness, foreseeing and predicting the Panama Canal. Breboeuf burning at the stake in the lake country, to save the souls of the savages. Dollard and his heroes dying at the Longue Saut to save the settlement. Mackenzie ringed with Indian foes, and uncertain whether he would see the sunrise, painting in enduring vermilion on the face of the rock at Bella Coola, the record of his journey. Simon Fraser, turned back in his descent of the river by hostile Indians, but not before he caught a glimpse of the sun shimmering on Boundary Bay and knew that the river to which he gave his name flowed into the Pacific. The little Parisian apothecary, Hebert, planting the first fruits and flowers and grain on the summit of the hill at Quebec. The Earl of Selkirk with his lonely comrades from Stornoway, harvesting the first meagre crop of wheat in the Red River valley—a crop which this year has expanded to the enormous proportions of half a billion bushels. The Irishman, D'Arcy McGee, pleading that Canadians might recover the sense that comprehends the sea, and predicting that the south seas would ultimately reflect Canadian sails as familiarly as did the Atlantic of his day. Howe, the Nova Scotian, far back on the Atlantic, hearing the future whistle of locomotives in the Rockies racing to the Western sea. Macdonald, the Scotch Canadian, fighting for a physically united Canada. Laurier, the French Canadian, striving for a spiritually united Canada—they are all on the mighty canvas which is the background of the Canadian stage.

These and a hundred others—what material for artist and poet, for novelist and historian. I make no apology for dropping into sentiment, when the mind runs back over the marvellous story of Canada—a story where the swift movement of events is almost as fascinating as that of the figures associated with them. He must have a sluggish soul who can recall it unmoved. The frail barques of the early navigators; the ox bow and Red River cart of the pioneer; the portage and the blazed trail; the lob-stick and tump line; the corduroy road; the clearing in the bush; the shack on the prairie; the grimy men and oxen in the logging field; the lone vista of the plains; and, then, the teeming city; the fast train and great steamship; the tractor; the flying machine—all spanned in the space of a few centuries.

Those who still retain their faith, cannot review that story without feeling that Providence or destiny has curiously over-ruled and directed the confused counsels of men to provide on the northern half of this continent a theatre too vast and spacious for petty enmities and insular prejudices, a stage worthy and capable of the noblest human endeavour. We shall best learn how to administer that trust if we fittingly recognize the varied factors which have combined to give it to our hands. If it does not teach us the lessons of gratitude, of humility, of goodwill, and of tolerance, we shall be very dull of wit and slow of comprehension.

There are two monuments in this Dominion, that span in the sentiments they express, the whole range of our spiritual development as a nation. Appropriately enough, they stand thousands of miles apart—one at the old historic gateway to this country and the other on the far frontiers of the Northland.

I used to think that the noblest inscription in the language was on the first—that on the shaft to the joint memory of Wolfe and Montcalm, on the Terrace at Quebec—"Valour gave them a common death, history a common fame, and posterity a common monument."

But now I prefer a humbler one on a huge promontory where the Peace and the Smoky Rivers converge, just at the old Peace River crossing, where the long trail winds off toward the Arctic. This bluff stands hundreds of feet high, and on the summit in the long summer twilight of the north may be readily descried a white shaft. It is the grave of Twelve Foot Davis. Davis was a pioneer miner of British Columbia and made a modest fortune out of a small twelve foot placer fraction which he staked in the Cariboo River bed. Hence his name. Later he became a trader and followed the rivers almost down to the Arctic. In late years he became almost blind and carried on his operations through the aid of a faithful Indian. But he remembered and loved this promontory with its lordly outlook far to the mountains of the west and to the north, the two points where his active life had been spent, and overlooking the river whose waters had so often borne him on his journeys. And so when old, blind and poor, he finally died on Lake Athabasca, he made a request that his body should be carried to this lofty point where his spirit might still enjoy the prospect. And there he lies today, with the white shaft above him and on it these words : "He was the friend of every man, and never locked his cabin door." Somehow the epitaph at Quebec leaves one unsatisfied, for, while it honours two heroes, it recalls, if it does not glorify, the strife of a less happy day. But the inscription over Twelve Foot Davis may well stand as a motto for a happier and saner Canada. It expresses the hospitable spirit of the West—which has been the lure of Canada ever since the Conquest. It voices the spirit of the North—the magic word in the new romance now opening in Canada. It means toleration to those of other faiths and races. It means disarmed minds in our contacts with other nations. It implies gratitude to those, the fruit of whose labour we enjoy. It means hospitality to less fortunate people. It means that if we would attain real greatness in this country we must, like Twelve Foot Davis, never lock the doors of our intellects or of our hearts.

THE ONTARIO VIEW OF THE ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY SCHEME

AN ADDRESS BY THE HON. SENATOR GEORGE LYNCH-STAUNTON, K.C.

29th November, 1928.

COL. BROCK, Vice-President, introduced the speaker, who was received with applause, and said :—Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—Coming as I do from the hamlet of Hamilton I am much flattered indeed by the reception which is given to me by so many people in Toronto. To tell the truth, I did not think there would be a baker's dozen to hear me. However, I appreciate exceedingly the honour of addressing you.

I have presumed to address you on the great Waterways. I shall not pretend to give you my opinion, because I consider that my opinion is worth about as much as that of the editor of the *Globe*, for example. (Laughter.) I am only taking him as representing his class. There is no use talking—I think this subject should be treated quite aside from rhetoric. Promoters launch every questionable enterprise by florid prospectuses, and we are in danger, as a people, of entering on public enterprises, driven into a conviction that they are correct by rhetorical addresses of people who do not know what they are talking about. (Hear, hear.)

Now, I am a life-long builder of castles in Spain, and I assure you that I could qualify for admission to the Bricklayers' Union if it was not that I never build castles except on Saturday afternoon and Sunday. I never allow them to come in any business hours.

People who count their chickens before they are hatched would never put so many rotten eggs under a hen if they would hold them up to the light to see whether they are muddy or clear. I propose to hold up to the light the arguments, pro and con, for the extension of our waterways, in order that you may see whether they are sterile or fit to put under the hen. Yet I do not intend to weary you with my opinion. I intend only to draw your attention to certain evidence, and ask you to make your own deductions from it. We have reports on this question, made by various committees which gave us evidence to show that it was possible to build these waterways and develop power on the St. Lawrence. Well, we can say that without any evidence at all, because men can do anything now except bore a hole through the world.

Then we had evidence—not evidence, for there is no evidence—but statements that if we builded this waterway ships from the ocean would go as far as Fort William; and in Fancy's mirror, ever clear, we saw the *Mauritania* and the *Majestic* straining at their anchors in Toronto harbor. I can assure you that if you wait to hear the echo of their whistle against the walls of the York building, you will never go down to the front to see them. It is an accepted fact now that ocean vessels will never, in a business way, come up the St. Lawrence as far as Toronto.

Now, I am not going to trouble you with the evidence that was given of that subject, as there is nothing before the country on which to form a business opinion. Rt. Hon. Mr. Graham, who had been on those Commissions, last Session suggested that we should have a committee in the Senate that would call before it people who knew—men skilled and interested in navigation and transportation, men whose opinion was worth having on the question whether it was now in the interest of Canada—not navigation, but Canada—to build this waterway. The Senate Committee heard the evidence of all those who were worth hearing, and of no more. That report is in existence, but of course, like all other parliamentary reports, is never read. This is my excuse for coming before you today and giving you the evidence that was brought before that Committee as to the desirability or non-desirability for Canada to build these waterways.

What is the present situation ? We have a waterway twenty feet deep, supporting a vessel that will draw 18 feet, from the head of the lakes, and, taking the Welland Canal to be completed, to Kingston; 27 feet in Welland; 20 feet in the Detroit, St. Marys, and so on; and it is proposed to deepen the canals and waterway from Kingston to Montreal so that vessels drawing 25 feet, or those big lakers, may deliver their cargo in Montreal. We are told that this is in the interest of Canada. Now, I do not care about navigation, and I am not interested in the foreigner—(hear, hear)—but I am interested in Canada.

Let me, as a parenthesis, say this to you, because I have found that where anybody advocates anything against public ownership, or development of things by the Government, he is always set down as a hireling of the big interests, or as interested as opposing the interests of the people. Now, I have no financial stock in any institution, or man or woman or child who is interested either in its development or non-development; I am not the lawyer for any of those huge corporations and power barons—they never had sense enough to employ me. (Laughter.) But I will tell you what I am, gentlemen; I am one of those cranks who, since I went into the Senate, realized that the country is paying me $4,000 a year—far too much (laughter)—and that it is my duty to take an interest in the public questions and things that affect my country. (Hear, hear, and applause.) Now, you know that those people who take themselves seriously are usually laughed at; but a man who takes himself seriously cannot help it, so he has to take that chance. I take this case quite seriously.

Now, what is the cost to Canada if we build this extension ?—because even in public questions costs sometimes count. I will give you only the totals, because time is short. We are paying half of the development on the international portion, 54 miles; the cost to Canada will be $224,600,000, plus $13,800,000—about $236,000,000. We have $150,000,000 in the Welland Canal—it was to have cost $50,000,000.

Leaving out the years of the war it has taken ten or twelve years to build it. Did you ever know an estimate that was not under the mark ? I never did. So if it is $130,000,000, I do not think it is exaggeration to expect it will cost $150,000,000; but let it go at their own figures.

What advantages are we to get from this canal ? That is what you want to know. We had before us the representative of the Transcontinental, the representative of the Montreal Harbor Commission, and several other men who are reliable, and they all agreed in one thing—that this waterway would be a good thing for Montreal, but they could not show why. They say that if we build it we will save a cent and a half per bushel on wheat—not five. They say that it costs a laker—one of those large ships—to go from the head of the lakes to Kingston or Prescott, and tranship at Montreal, 6.57 cents a bushel; but if we build it right through it will cost him 4.22 cents per bushel. Here are the figures—cost under the present system, Fort William to Port Colborne by typical large freighters, 2.39; by typical canal freighter 4.81; total, 7.20. They say that when the Welland Canal is through to carry it to Prescott it will cost 6.20 per bushel to carry it into Montreal. I hope I have made that clear. If you get it to Montreal by the other way it will cost 4.22. On that calculation you save two cents a bushel by extending the waterway.

Those calculations have been made in this way: they say that is what it will cost to ship if the ship operates for 230 days, and has no delays, and gets a full cargo every time she goes to Fort William. Well, I was for many years a director of a shipping company, and I never knew a ship that had not delays, and I never knew a ship that got full cargoes every time she went to Fort William. I don't believe she gets it three times out of four. So that is what you call an ideal trip; in fact it is on paper. Mr. James Playfair said in his evidence that the average freight to Montreal throughout the year is seven cents, and he says they are carrying it for nothing—absolutely no money in it at all.

Now, that is the cost to the ship, and you will save one cent, two cents, call it three if you like; that is the way we do when we are figuring out; we say we are going to make $50,000, and we say, "Cut it in two, and we will make $25,000 any way." But you must add to that the profit that the boat has got, so how are you going to save anything ? That is not rhetoric; those are the cold figures made up by those gentlemen, they said, from actual enquiry from the steamship men as to the steady cost of operation, cost of the boat, and so on. That is the fact, and rhetoric cannot blow that away. That is what the evidence says, and I assure you, gentlemen, that I am not distorting the evidence in the least.

Now, how much are we going to use that canal when we get it done ? Well, they tell us that there is an ever-rising tide of wheat flowing from the boundless West; we will use it for that. But do we ? Curious thing, that we have the cheapest combined rail-and-water haul to the seaboard on this continent when that seaboard is in Montreal. It costs more money to send a cargo of Canadian wheat to Buffalo and to New York, and then to England, whether you make it rail-and-water or water alone to the seaboard, and water thereafter, of course, till it freezes over; and yet the major portion of our wheat goes by New York, though you can carry it cheaper by Montreal.

Do you know that last year we carried about 135,000,000 bushels, and Senator MacDougald, who is a member of the Montreal Harbor Commission, told us that 91,000,000 of that was American; and I have the tables here which show what we did in former years, and so far as I can analyze those tables we never in our existence carried more than fifty-fifty bushels of Canadian wheat down the St. Lawrence. Therefore we are providing for carrying half of the receipts of America, and we are putting up all this money to put five cents a bushel into the pocket of the American farmer.

The way some people make up their calculations is amazing. One gentleman came before us and said that we will save five cents a bushel on 140,000,000 bushels—which has never gone down—which will pay the cost of the Welland Canal. Then he said we were going to draw in 800,000 tons of Welsh coal to Toronto—that is, only when the steamers come up from the ocean, and we are going to save $3 a ton on that. Well, that is the first time that I ever heard of a rule not working both ways. If the exporter, being the Manitoba farmer, saves five cents, why will not the English exporter of coal save the $3 ? We won't. I say that on their own showing it cannot benefit Canada one copper to reduce the cost of all the inbound freight. If it does, then it does not benefit Canada one copper to reduce the cost of outbound freight. That is what the evidence shows.

Then we have to consider another item. The mysteries of trade are past finding out. It is the most mysterious thing, and I have never seen any of those political economists that ever solved anything. (Laughter.) Years ago I was always told that money was a medium; that was the doctrine of political economy. Now it is recognized to be a commodity. They have blown that theory into the skies. You are told that this will reduce the cost to the Canadian farmer because the shipowner can carry it cheaper. But will he put down the price ? He says, "I am only carrying it now at cost." Mr. Playfair says, "The only time we can jack up the rates a little is when there is a big choke up the lakes." Don't you suppose they will keep the rates jacked up as high as they can ?

What reason have we to think that if we make the St. Lawrence 40 feet deep the shipowners will bring down rates ? They won't do it. It is not human nature. You can't control them. Therefore I say they have not yet proved to me, or shown to me, that patent way of reducing rates at all; and if they have, they have not proved the saving to the Canadian people—

I am not meaning to the world—of one-quarter of the interest it will cost us to extend this fine thing. They have not shown us that the Canadian people will use it. Our experience is that the Canadian people do not. We have got the maximum tonnage carried on that river St. Lawrence between Montreal and Welland, 5,000,000 tons; that is what it has gone up to, while the railways have gone up to 122,000,000.

With regard to shippers lowering the freight rate, I make this proposition, that no man can point in the history of transportation to any place where the cost did not go uo when facilities were increased. I am not talking about the Panama Canal, because that cut off about 4,000 miles, nor the Suez Canal, which did the like. But what did we have ? In the old days our cars carried 25 tons; now they carry over 40 to 100. Our grades were three per cent.; now they are flattened down to the disappearing point. The rails were 50 pounds; now they are 80 to 100. Our trains were light tuppenny-ha'penny things; now our rail facilities have gone up enormously, hundreds fold. And the cost has gone up. I have come out of the estuary of the Thames and seen steamboats parked in there like motor-cars on Front street—no business—showing that there was a surplus of tonnage on the Atlantic. Vessels have been increased enormously from 2,000 tons up to 10,000, and passengers up to fifty times. Facilities have increased, but the cost has gone up. So it is inevitable.

When we begin to think of the electric current in this country it was manufactured by a few little isolated plants through the country. Now we have spent $100,000,000, and we have 1,000,000 horsepower which we are getting at cost. Yet the cost has gone up. The more facilities you have, the more cost you have. You cannot blame the increased price of electric current in this Province on the power barons, because we control it ourselves; but the cost has gone up. Yet somebody tells you that if you deepen the water you will save the cost !

The truth is that canals are a back number. Nobody hauls anything by canal except coarse, low-cost freight, and freight that would not move at all if you did not haul it by water—wheat, sand, heavy pipes, and things of that kind that cannot stand the high rate. One gentleman told us that Eaton here never sends anything by boat to Toronto; they won't stand for the time; and a friend of mine in the railways tells me that if by transhipping of them they can get it cheaper by boat from Montreal they won't do it. Now, you know; you are business people.

One thing they said they will get is that they will steal away from the railroads all the flour that goes down by Port McNichol. Very little of it now goes by water, but they will take it cheaper that way. I don't think they can take it away; and I don't think it would be in your interest if they did, for we have about two billion dollars invested in the National Railways, and we are handing out to them $75,000,000 to $100,000,000 a year to keep it going. Then we have the C.P.R., which in my humble judgment is the backbone of Canada. (Hear, hear, and applause.) In my opinion it has done more than any and all the agencies that exist for the development of this country, and I don't want to injure them, and I don't want to injure the National.

They tell us that at certain seasons of the year those canals are congested. That's a great word; I don't know what it means, half of the time; but one witness said 80,000 bushels can go through those canals as they exist now, and if you put in Diesel engines—which will be done—you can carry 120,000 bushels through the new canals; we can nearly double their capacity.

Then we have got the Hudson Bay. That mighty ocean is to be opened to carry outborne freight to Europe from the West. It won't come down here, will it ?—if that dream comes true; and in my opinion—and my opinion is not worth that (snapping his finger)—it never will. But we have got it, and we have to consider the wheat it will take away from this waterway, because grain is the only thing of which we export all of it. When we are talking of putting in another $150,000,000 you ought to think about it in Ontario and Quebec, because you are the people who have to pay for it. It is the manufacturing industries and the people who pay income tax that have to find the money for this, and the only pleasure you will have will be to increase the taxation of this country, which is now so stimulating to our industries.

Now, as far as I can see, that is a faithful and a truthful resume of the evidence that came before that Committee—interlarded with my own remarks. To sum it up, it means that by this waterway we will save on the outbound traffic one to two cents per bushel; that the maximum amount of Canadian wheat that goes out there has never been more than 56,000,000 bushels; that we are providing that for American traffic; that our own traffic goes, and will continue to go the other way. You see, the American traffic comes on in July and August, a month ahead of us, and they use this for their surplus. They export as much as we do of wheat. We think we are the granary of the world, but we are no more the granary of the world than Russia or the United States. Oh, get your heads out of the clouds, gentlemen, when you are talking business. Look at what the facts are, and not what the facts are said to be.

Then I submit to you, according to this evidence, that if the time arrives—it has not arrived yet—we have ample capacity; and canal transportation is the dearest in the world. If you charge up the cost to the shipper, and charge them a toll through our canals, and let them break even on the cost, they would never use it at all.

Of course if you took the Transcontinental lines here and carried things for nothing, letting people use the roadbed for nothing, and running their own cars over it, if we provided this at no cost, you would think people would use it—but they don't. That is that evidence.

Now I want to tell you a few things about that international development of power. Is it necessary for us to go into that now ? Have we got enough power in

Ontario? Well, when I saw the members of the Government and every one of the Hydro Commission on their knees to the little town where I was born, begging them to take their power, I came to the conclusion that they must have a surplus, and that we have got more power than we know what to do with, or they would not run to a little town of 200 or 300 people. At least I drew that inference.

This power is to be developed at the foot of Harnhart Island. It happens that at that point the international boundary comes within a few feet of the Canadian shore, so that the dam across the St. Lawrence, if built, will be 95 per cent. in American territory. Now, the Aluminum Company of America owns the shore and the bottom of the river on the American side; owns Barnhart Island; owns the company that owns the Canadian shore; so that they own the whole thing. We are told that the proposition is to shift the international boundary line so as to put half the dam on our side and half on their side. Well, the United States Government cannot shift that boundary line. The constitution of the United States provides that the United States shall protect each state from invasion; and if they carry out their obligation to the States they cannot allow any foreign power to get one inch of the territory of any State. So they cannot shift the boundary line unless the State of New York agrees to it.

Then, in my opinion, it is altogether objectionable, and unprecedented in the history of man, for any country to enter into a commercial partnership with any other country. Partners often quarrel, and when those partners are two nations and quarrel, it is serious. Let us take George Washington's advice to the Americans in this regard, and keep ourselves, commercially at least, from entangling alliances. (Applause.)

But supposing we make that bargain, supposing we build that dam, we admit that at present we have no use for it. We will want it in those halcyon days when Canada is as big as the United States—which of course is going to be the day after to-morrow; but in the meantime we don't want it. There will be at least loads of time between the period we finish it and the time we want it.

Now, the American Government does not own the territory; does not own anything; has no control over that territory excepting for navigation. But the Canadian Government does not own it, and has no control whatever over those waters except for navigation. But supposing the Aluminum Company builds the dam, they will own the canal unless the Ontario Government expropriates it, and that Mr. Hoover will not go into that noble experiment of public ownership. He denounced it for all he knew how in New York the other day, and he was backed in his presidential election by all the private interests in the United States, because he is absolutely opposed to any public ownership creeping into the Federal Government of the United States; so they won't take it up. So it will be developed by the Aluminum Company, which will be in partnership with the Federal Government if they expropriate the piece on our side—and they can do that. Then, Chicago-like, they will take more water than was given to them. Supposing they take all the territory, or supposing they take three-fourths—we are not using it—our Ambassador at Washington goes down to raise a kick; the Secretary of State sheds a few Alice-in-Wonderland tears and says, "We can't do anything; we are sorry; we never thought that they would break their word." Or supposing they say, "Well, we will stop them." What do they do? They will go to Court—that is what they had to do in Chicago. You know the American Government can't do anything unless it goes to court; and in Chicago when they went to court they got the judge to hold up the judgment for nine years; he said he was not going to see Chicago poisoned. I am told that it was sixteen years; any way, it was nine; that is that baseball player. (Laughter.) Well, he was the umpire in this game. What is to prevent them from doing that over there ? You can't confiscate any property of the United States, you know.

These are just a few of the complications which will arise; and I say that until we have developed all the power along the St. Lawrence river—and there are millions of horse-power there—let us let that lie the way it is; and if we have any spark of decency in us as to provinces, Quebec and Ontario will get together and agree that these enormous principalities of wealth—sources of power along the St. Lawrence below the international portion—will be developed for the general benefit of Canada. (Applause.) And it won't require that development. If the time comes when we have to develop it, in my judgment the only way to keep us out of danger, of quarreling with our neighbours, is for us to make a bargain with the United States Government that they will develop the whole thing and own it, and agree to give us a certain quantity of it; or to make a bargain with the United States Government that we will develop it and own it, and give them a certain quantity of the power—their half—but no joint management, no joint control, between the two nations. (Hear, hear, and loud applause.)

On the suggestion of the Chairman, the audience rose and stood silently to show their sympathy with His Majesty the King in his illness.

HON. MR. JUSTICE KELLY expressed the thanks of the Club to the speaker for his interesting address.

THE NATIONAL IMPORTANCE OF THE SALMON INDUSTRY

AN ADDRESS BY THE HONOURABLE JOHN HALL KELLY, K.C.
MEMBER OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

6th December, 1928.

PRESIDENT FENNELL introduced the speaker, who spoke as follows :—If we allow our imagination to carry us back to the days when the red man reigned supreme in this beautiful part of Canada, and if we picture ourselves as standing on the cliffs at Niagara Falls on a bright evening in the month of June between the magic hours of seven and nine, we should have seen hundreds and hundreds of beautiful salmon playing and jumping in the crystal waters below after having completed their journey of a thousand miles and more from the deep waters of the Atlantic. If later on in the season we had skirted the shores of your beautiful lake in a little bark canoe and had ascended the Credit, the Humber and numerous other streams we should have seen there, during the months of October and November, thousands of salmon preparing to return to their winter homes at the end of the spawning season.

With the coming of the white man who brought with him new ideas of progress and civilization, with the clustering together of people in villages, towns and cities, and with the pollution of rivers and streams, the salmon have been gradually driven back until today we find them only in the lower stretches of the St. Lawrence, the Gulf, and the Bay des Chaleurs. It is in that part of our country, where I have spent most of my lifetime, that I have studied our Atlantic salmon concerning which I shall now speak to you.

It is now generally admitted that salmon, as a rule, do not wander very far away from the mouth of the stream up which they return to spawn. They spend the winter in the waters of the Bay des Chaleurs around the Island of Anticosti and in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. In the spring there is a general movement amongst the salmon. This, according to Griswold, is caused by the development of the sexual organs of the fish. He tells us that as the sexual organs of the salmon become larger their breathing becomes more difficult and they lose their appetite. They then strike for the shore and seek other waters where they can breathe more freely, and where they spawn.

After leaving the deep water they feel their way along the shore, looking for the river to which they return to spawn. It is then that they come in contact with the first obstacle on their nuptial journey, the salmon net. These salmon nets consist of a bar net of about 150 to 300 fathoms in length which is tied to the shore with a rope which bars the passage of the fish. The bar net has a depth of eight to twelve feet, and has three traps which are placed at equal distances apart.

The salmon finding that their way along the shore is blocked by the bar net, then swim along by the side of the net. Some of the smaller salmon pass through the meshes of the bar net because these meshes, under the Dominion regulation, must not be less than six inches when extended. The first regulation of this kind originated in Scotland when in 1371 Robert the First decreed that the space between the boughs of the willows used for taking fish should be at least two inches. Some of the salmon try to force their way through the meshes of the bar net. If they do so and the mesh is too small to let them through, the fish generally die because they keep pushing against the net and in doing so the net closes the gills of the fish and they perish in a few seconds. If the salmon in such cases would back up instead of pushing ahead, they would easily release themselves.

While finding their way along the bar net, the salmon enter the traps and once they enter they have not very long to live. With the falling tide the fisherman goes over his net, and with a long pole at the end of which is attached a dip net he takes the salmon out of the traps. The fish are then taken ashore and are immediately packed in boxes with ice, two to three hundred pounds to the box, and are shipped to the various markets. Only a small proportion of our Gaspé salmon find their way to the Canadian markets. Most of them go to the American market. A few years ago, in the early days of prohibition, one of the Custom officials by chance opened one of these boxes in which the salmon were shipped and, much to his surprise, discovered that not a few of the salmon contained bottles of Scotch whiskey.

As the fish find their way along the Gaspé shores, they reach numerous rivers up which they can go to spawn. But nature has wisely provided that these fish do not all enter the first stream they come to. They seek the river in which they were born.

Some twenty-five years ago I happened to be at a fishing port when the fishermen were taking the salmon from their boats. While they were packing their fish I heard them saying that they had a number of the Grand Cascapedia fish and some of the Bonaventure river fish. They all looked alike to me. I then placed several fish side by side, marked them and approaching four fishermen, one after the other, asked them to pick out the Grand Cascapedia fish and the Bonaventure river fish. They did so, and the result was correct in each case.

The salmon do not go from salt water into fresh water as soon as they arrive at their native river. For a while they play about at its mouth and by degrees become accustomed to the fresher water in the estuaries of the river before they strike up stream.

The habits of the salmon change as they move from salt water to fresh. Whilst in the sea they travel mostly during the day. In fresh water they generally travel only at night. They take the fly in fresh water but not in salt water, although cases have been known where they have taken the fly in brackish water in the estuary, but that is the exception. The salmon do not eat whilst in fresh water; at least we have no evidence that they do, but they make up for it whilst in the sea. A salmon loses weight after he enters the stream and the longer he remains in fresh water the less beautiful he becomes. During the months of August and September his body becomes tinted with reddish spots and his silvery coat becomes dull. After a whole winter spent in fresh water, as often happens, the beautiful salmon of the previous spring is a long, lanky, dark coloured fish with very little vitality, and when hooked offers little or no resistance.

In the Province of Quebec most of our salmon rivers are leased. It is sometimes asked, "Why are these rivers leased? Why are they not open to everybody?" The answer is that the rivers that are leased have fish in them and those that are not leased have no fish, although in former years they were good salmon rivers. It takes a long time to make a good salmon stream. It takes only a few seasons of poaching to ruin it. I do not believe that it is possible for any government to protect a salmon river as effectively as can be done by private enterprise.

In the Province of Quebec our rivers are leased by private agreement for periods varying from five and nine to fifteen years. Some people believe that it would be better to lease our rivers at public auction at certain fixed periods. There is much to be said for both systems, but if we bear in mind that our first object would be the preservation of our salmon industry and not simply the immediate revenue derived from the rentals, then leasing by private agreement is certainly the better system. Under it the lessee has some incentive to protect and improve the stream he leases, because, he knows that when his lease expires he will reap the benefit of his care by having his lease renewed.

We have many great salmon rivers in the Province of Quebec, but I shall mention only two, the Grand Cascapedia and the Ristigouche.

From 1878 to 1893 the Grand Cascapedia river was fished by the different Governors-General of Canada. From 1878 to 1883 it was fished by the Marquis of Lorne, from 1883 to 1888 by Lord Lansdowne, and from 1888 to 1893 by Lord Stanley.

In 1893, during the tenure of office of Lord Aberdeen, who was not a fisherman, the river was leased to the Grand Cascapedia Club. This club consisted originally of ten members, John L. Cadwalader, E. W. Davis, R. G. Dun, Henry W. de Forest, H. B. Hollins, John S. Kennedy, Dr. S. Weir Mitchell, Philip Schuyler, J. J. Van Allen, and W. K. Vanderbilt.

On all well organized salmon rivers a daily record is kept showing the date, the weight of each fish, the fly with which it was taken, and the name of the pool where it was killed. The records of the Grand Cascapedia River, as well as of the Ristigouche, are most interesting and instructive.

In 1879 on the Grand Cascapedia, the Hon. C. Ellis, L. Iveson and Captain G. A. Percy fished from June 9th to August 15th, and Capt. R. N. Fane and Captain Drummond, R.N., fished from July 25th to August 1st. They killed 647 fish weighing 16,288 ℔s. One hundred and thirty-five of these fish weighed thirty pounds and over. The best day's fishing went to Captain Percy, who killed 17 fish weighing 465 ℔s., averaging 27 ℔s. In 1886 R. G. Dun killed a fish weighing 54 ℔s. and in 1892 Hon. Victor Stanley killed a fish weighing 53 ℔s.

On the Ristigouche River, records have been kept since 1880, in which year the Ristigouche Salmon Club was formed. In 1880 the club members killed on the club waters 125 fish weighing 1,638 ℔s., with an average weight of 12 ℔s. In 1927 the club members killed 1,315 fish weighing 23,662 ℔s., with an average weight of 19 ℔s. During the past 48 years the number killed on the Ristigouche was 37,908 fish weighing 637,730 ℔s., with an average weight of 17.35 ℔s. During the last ten years the club killed a total of 14,865 fish. This indeed is a very small number as compared to the catches during the same period in the salmon nets. It is sometimes said that the rod fishermen are ruining our salmon rivers. The very opposite is the truth. The net fishermen are taking more fish in their nets today because of the protection afforded the streams by the rod fishermen who have made very serious efforts not only to protect the rivers but who also have paid out large sums of money to the net fishermen for the removal of nets which had been allowed too far up stream, and which had prevented the salmon from ascending the rivers to spawn.

In the year 1005 Malcolm the Second of Scotland enacted the first law relating to the close season for fish, and since that time many other laws and regulations have been adopted, the enforcement of which is not always an easy matter. May I mention a few of the more common offenses ? The Dominion regulations state that all salmon nets should be tied up from sunset on Saturday to sunrise of the following Monday, the object being to leave a free passage way for the fish at least once a week. This tying up is done by means of a rope which is passed under and over the bar net, and which when tightened brings together the upper and lower ends of the net. Sometimes in order to circumvent the law, a fisherman will tie a stone at each end of a piece of rope about three feet long, and throw the stones and rope over the top of the net. This causes the top line of the net to sink a few feet and creates the impression that the net is tied up and out of fishing order, which is not the case. "Drifting" at the mouth of a salmon river when the fish are running is also another means of breaking the law. Formerly when coming down stream with their scows, the lumberjacks would drag a pool with a drift net, thus securing a number of fish. Nets tied under the booms and logs in the rivers is another means sometimes resorted to. Dynamiting is a thing of the past on most of our salmon rivers. Poaching with flambeau and spear has a greater appeal for the poacher than any other way of taking salmon. On a dark night in the fall of the year, two

Ford cars with eight or ten boys will start on a poaching trip. They will drive along the river's bank, keeping a sharp lookout for the guardians. Once they decide on the pools where they intend to try their luck, six or eight of the poachers will hide in different places along the side of the stream, in the trees, and two others will go out on the river with a canoe or raft and with flambeau and spear. The spear is generally made by the village blacksmith who enjoys the confidence of the poachers. The flambeau is made of bark, but if the poaching happens to be in a river near the C.N.R. Railway it is easier to steal the waste from the boxes of freight cars, as this makes a better flambeau. Many a C.N.R. freight train has suffered from a hot box owing to the poachers. The boys in the canoe or raft find their way down stream and when they see a salmon in a pool they spear it and take it ashore. If a guardian is seen coming along, the sentinels on the shore flash a light, blow a horn, or give some other signal, and immediately the men in the boat put out their light by dipping it in the stream. If the guardians are nearby the men in the boat have trouble in escaping. They jump into the water, if it is not too deep, and wade ashore. The guardians have strong explosive lights as well as electric lights which, when lighted, illuminate the whole river. The poachers when caught are hard to recognize; in fact it is nearly impossible to do so. They blacken their faces and change their clothing, usually using as garment an ordinary bag in which they make two holes for their arms. It is thus often impossible for the guardian to recognize his man. If there are only two guardians and eight or ten poachers, the latter, as a rule, succeed in getting their pal away from the guardians unless these latter are armed. Several cases of shooting have taken place where poachers were wounded and in one case a guardian was shot dead. Owing to very effective guardianship, poaching with flambeau and spear is seldom heard of nowadays. Even with flambeau and spear, the poachers do not secure many fish, but the poaching, if not kept down, would cause great damage to a salmon river. The penalties in these cases are never very heavy. Times have changed since Robert the Third punished with death any one caught killing a salmon out of season.

In order to protect our salmon rivers against the dangers of poaching, numerous guardians are employed. Some clubs protect only their own waters. On other rivers the guardianship of the river is carried on by an association composed of the various fishing clubs or anglers on the river. The largest organization of this kind exists on the Ristigouche river. In 1915 the Ristigouche Riparian Association was incorporated by a special Dominion Act and since then the guardianship of the Ristigouche river has been carried on by this association. It employs over one hundred and twenty-five guardians, at an annual expenditure of over thirty-three thousand dollars. Since 1915 the association has spent over seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars to protect and improve the river. The people who live along our salmon rivers are kind and sympathetic, and when good fellowship exists between the anglers and the people, which is happily nearly always the case, the problem of guardianship becomes a very simple one.

In order to improve the rivers most of our clubs have adopted rules and regulations limiting the number of fish that may be killed. For instance on the Grand Cascapedia the club has placed a limit of eight fish per rod per day. If a member has a guest and the latter kills say five fish in one day, that member can kill only three fish the same day. Some years ago the suggestion was made that the law should be amended to fix the number of salmon that any one may legally kill at not more than eight per day. It was considered advisable not to have the law so amended but to obtain the same result by means of the various clubs adopting a rule to that effect. It was felt that additional restrictions in virtue of the law to the right of fishing should not be multiplied.

When the time comes for the salmon to spawn they select a part of the river where the bed is composed principally of sand and gravel and where the water is fairly swift and about 18 to 20 inches deep. The female fish deposits her eggs in a hole which she makes in the sand and gravel and the male fish then fertilizes them with his milt. The eggs are very porous and being very heavy sink quickly to the bottom of the river. While the female fish is awaiting the time to deposit her eggs the male fish takes up a position a few feet below her, and as soon as she deposits some of them the male fish leaps forward to deposit his milt. If any time were lost the eggs would fill with water and would be destroyed. The female does not deposit all her eggs at once, the time taken extending over a few days. When the spawning is over, the fish return to the sea. It often happens that the fish are trapped by ice forming over the pools, and when this takes place they are imprisoned until the ice goes out the following spring. I have heard the guides tell of some one hundred fish and more being trapped in a small pool and how during the winter months they could on certain days see the fish through the ice.

Much has been learned in recent years concerning the habits of salmon, due to the work of investigation carried on in Scotland. In 1904 Mr. Johnson made the important discovery that the age of a salmon can be determined by counting, under the microscope, the number of rings formed yearly on the scale of the fish. As a rule the salmon in European waters spawn only once. A few years ago the scales of about three hundred of the river Moisie fish were sent over to Scotland for examination, and it was then ascertained that thirty-five of these fish had spawned once, eleven had spawned twice, sixteen had spawned three times and one had spawned four times, thus establishing the interesting fact that in the Province of Quebec even the salmon have large families.

In my opening remarks I mentioned that in the early settlement days of Ontario, salmon abounded in Lake Ontario and the streams that empty therein. It is not necessary to go so far back to find evidence of the existence of salmon in these waters. Writing in 1860, Sir James Edward Alexander referred to the fact that "salmon ascend the St. Lawrence and enter the St. Francis, the Credit, the Humber and other streams beyond Toronto, and are then speared and taken in nets. . . ."

In 1890 the Ontario Government appointed a commission to enquire into the condition of the fish and game in this Province. In the report made by the Commission in 1890 we find a statement officially recording the fact that "the sea salmon can hardly be said nowadays to be an Ontario fish." Mr. Samuel Wilmot, of the Dominion Fishery Service, recorded its disappearance from Lake Ontario fifteen years previously, that is to say only seventeen years after the time when Sir James Alexander stated that the fish still ascended to those waters.

May we not pause and ask ourselves if the same conditions that did away with the salmon in these splendid lakes and streams do not exist today in connection with our other inland fisheries.

What is the greatest danger with which we are obliged to contend at the present time as regards our fisheries? It is undoubtedly the pollution of the streams, particularly from pulp mills. The reason why is a very simple one. In order that fish may live in a stream there must be oxygen in the water. Remove the oxygen and all forms of fish life become impossible. The pollution of a stream as regards fish by a one hundred ton pulp mill is equivalent to the pollution thereof from domestic sewerage from a city of the population of one hundred and sixty thousand people. The sulphuric acids from a pulp mill rob the water of its oxygen.

In this connection various experiments have been carried out. In 1915 Wells of the University of Illinois experimented with blue gills. He mixed sulphuric acid with water, the mixture consisting of seven parts of sulphuric acid to one million parts of water. The fish placed therein died in sixty hours.

In 1907 Dr. Marsh, of the United States Geological Survey, experimented with perch, bass and trout fry. He took the liquor direct from a pulp mill digester and mixed it with water in the proportions of one to ten and one to two hundred. The fish placed therein died in periods of two and a half hours to eighteen days according to the strength of the mixture.

Last summer it became known that the International Paper Company proposed building a one hundred and fifty ton pulp mill at Dalhousie at the mouth of the Ristigouche River, and that the Fraser Companies also intended building a pulp mill of the same capacity at Athol, some twenty-five miles farther up the stream. The fishing interests were naturally disturbed and immediately set about examining what the effect would be upon the salmon that enter the Ristigouche. I was retained to inquire into the situation in order to see what could be done to save the fisheries. After examining numerous rivers where pulp mills had been erected I had the advantage of going over part of the ground with Mr. Bernard Phelps, of Columbia University, one of the outstanding authorities in the United States on stream pollution. Professor Phelps proceeded on the assumption that if there is a sufficient flow of water in a stream in order to dilute the acids, a pulp mill can exist even on a salmon river provided that the screenings, etc., from the mill are not allowed to enter the stream. He measured the flow at Dalhousie, where the International Paper Company also proposed building, the quantity of water going in and out daily with the tide, and found that a one hundred and fifty ton pulp mill can be safely built at the mouth of the Ristigouche.

As regards the Fraser mill at Athol the situation was a more serious one because the mill site is at the head of the tide. The fishermen were anxious to find some solution by means of which the acids from the mill would not destroy the fishing in the river. Different suggestions were made. One was that the mill should be built further down stream at Campbellton. Another was that the acids should be pumped to a point farther down stream as is done in connection with certain oyster beds in the United States. Still a better and cheaper method was sought and Professor Phelps finally suggested a method which is cheap in construction and effective as regards the results to be expected. It consists of making a pond outside the mill, having a superficial area of fifty thousand square feet, the pond to be five feet deep and twice as wide as it is long. This would require a pond a little over 150 feet by 300. The acids from the mill while passing through this pond, by being exposed to the air and cooled, improve thirty-five per cent as regards their dangerous effect upon fish life. While the margin of safety is small, if the pond is built and all screenings are kept out of the river it will still be possible to have this mill at Athol. This goes to prove that fishing and industry under certain conditions can exist together on the same stream.

The law as it now reads prohibits pulp mills from diverting even a drop of its acids into a stream where there are fish. It is impossible for a pulp mill to operate without diverting the liquor from the digesters somewhere. The result is that nearly every pulp mill in the country is violating the law. The time has arrived when the law should be amended so as to permit industry to make use of a stream up to the point where it will not endanger fish life, but when once that point has been reached no further use should be made of the stream unless we are prepared to sacrifice one of our greatest national assets, our fisheries.

Gentlemen, I had intended telling you something about the actual fishing for salmon with rod and line. May I suggest instead that one and all of you come salmon fishing with me next spring and I will then have the pleasure of giving you a practical lesson instead of a technical one.

The HON. MR. PRICE expressed the thanks of the Club to the speaker for his interesting address.

APPENDIX I

REPORT OF THE ANNUAL MEETING

The Annual Meeting was held on the 10th of January, 1929, in the King Edward Hotel, after the Address at the weekly luncheon had been delivered by The Honourable J. Hall Kelly, K.C. Mr. Robert Fennell, the President, occupied the chair, and the Secretary, Mr. H. G. Stapells, M.A., reported a most successful year's work. The luncheons had been well-attended and many of the addresses which had been delivered were exceptionally interesting. The Report was adopted, as was also that of the Nominating Committee as follows:—

Mr. Hugh S. Eayrs	President
Mr. C. V. Syrett	First Vice-President
Mr. William Tyrell	Second Vice-President
Major George A. Drew	Secretary-Treasurer

Committee

Rev. Dr. R. N. Burns
Mr. W. H. Clarke
Mr. F. J. Coombs
Provost F. H. Cosgrave
Mr. E. G. Davies
Mr. W. J. Darby
Mr. K. J. Dunstan
Mr. S. J. Frame
Colonel Alexander Fraser
Lt.-Col. B. O. Hooper, D.S.O., M.C.
Mr. F. B. Fetherstonhaugh
Mr. H. T. Jamieson
Lt.-Col. Baptist Johnston, V.D.
Mr. W. E. Lemon
Mr. E. M. Morris
Mr. Dana Porter
Colonel C. W. Roley
Mr. J. D. Spence
Mr. H. G. Stapells
Mr. R. T. Stanley
Mr. C. P. Tisdall

The above-named, together with the immediate past-president, Mr. Robert Fennell, and the representatives chosen by the Past-Presidents, constitute the governing body of the Club for 1929.

THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT

THE RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS FOR THE YEAR ENDING 31st DECEMBER, 1928, were as follows:

Receipts

Balance brought forward, 1st January, 1928,			$44.21
Income:			
Annual Fees :			
Resident	$4,235.70		
Non-Resident	68.70		
		$4,304.40	
Interest on Bank Account		26.62	
Sale of Year Book		6.00	
			4,337.02
			$4,381.23

Payments.

Expenditure—General Expenses :			
Salary	$1,200.00		
Gratuities	25.00		
Printing and Stationery, including cost of Year Book	1,351.62		
Telephone and Telegraph	135.63		
Office Expense	16.65		
Travelling and Entertainment.	327.13		
Cigars	52.50		
Reporting	216.00		
Postage	355.50		
Miscellaneous	21.25		
		$3,701.28	
Guests and Luncheons		627.72	
			$4,329.00
Cash on Hand, 31st December, 1928.			$52.23

This Statement was accompanied by the Certificate of MESSRS. H. T. JAMIESON & COMPANY, Chartered Accountants,

Honorary Auditors.

Before vacating the chair, Mr. Fennell returned his grateful thanks to the officers, Executive Committee and members of the Club for their generous assistance during his term of office. The duties which fell to the President were as they were aware many and onerous, but to him they never were a burden, largely because of the support, whole-hearted and self-sacrificing, which he at all times received from his devoted colleagues. These happy relationships would always be a most happy memory. Might he single out, without seeming to be invidious, Mr. Stapells, for special commendation. The demands of his business were such that he could not any longer continue in the office of Secretary. They all wished him a long and prosperous career in his arduous profession. Mr. Fennell then bespoke for Mr. Eayrs, his successor, the loyal support of the membership of the Club. The newly-elected President was duly installed in office.

Mr. Eayrs received a cordial welcome, the members rising to their feet as he assumed office. He expressed his deep appreciation of the honour conferred upon him and said that he fully believed the members and officers who were experienced in the work of the Club would extend to him the help which they have never failed to give to his predecessors. With that help they could look forward to a continuation of the excellent work done by the Club throughout the many years of its existence. Their sphere was vast and the objects they had in view were of first-class importance. They could achieve much by wise, concerted effort and he looked forward, with their help, to a successful and satisfactory year. (*Applause.*)

VALUABLE SERVICES ACKNOWLEDGED.

The President called on Colonel Alexander Fraser to convey to Mr. Stapells an expression of the warm feelings entertained by the Club for him.

Colonel Fraser, in a few felicitious sentences alluded to the efficiency, urbanity and tactful capacity which had characterized Mr. Stapells' services as Secretary-Treasurer for the four years now come to an end ; and on behalf of the Officers and members of the Executive Committee for 1928, presented him with a life membership in the Club and wrist-watch.

Mr. Stapells thanked his colleagues for these gifts which he said were but one more evidence of the good-feeling which had made his duties such a pleasure to him. He would cherish the memory of his official connection with the Club in the days to come and hoped he could still render service as a private member in a cause which appealed so strongly to his heart as did the tie with the Mother Country, the bond of Empire. (*Applause*).

Major Drew was introduced and warmly welcomed, after which the meeting adjourned.

APPENDIX II

HONORARY PRESIDENTS OF THE EMPIRE CLUB OF CANADA, 1903-1927.

1903–1912. Rt. Hon. Lord Strathcona and Mount Royal, G.C.M.G., LL.D., D.C.L.*

1913. Field Marshall H.R.H. The Duke of Connaught and Strathearn, K.G., G.C.M.G.

PAST PRESIDENTS :

1903–04. 1904–05.	Brig.-General James Mason.*
1905–06.	Reverend William Clark, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L.*
1906–07.	Mr. J. P. Murray.
1907–08.	Mr. J. F. M. Stewart, B.A.
1908–09.	Mr. D. J. Goggin, M.A., D.C.L.
1909–10.	Mr. Elias Clouse, M.D.
1910–11.	Mr. J. Castell Hopkins, F.S.S.*
1911–12.	Mr. F. B. Fetherstonhaugh, K.C.
1912–13.	Right Reverend James F. Sweeny, M.A., D.D., D.C.L.
1913–14.	Mr. Justice James Craig.
1914–15.	Lieut.-Colonel R. J. Stuart.
1915–16.	Mr. Albert Ham. Mus. Doc.
1916–17.	Mr. James Black Perry.
1917–18.	Mr. Norman Sommerville, M.A., K.C.
1918.	Mr. F. J. Coombs.
1919.	Mr. R. A. Stapells.
1920.	Mr. Arthur Hewitt.
1921.	Brig.-General C. H. Mitchell, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., LL.D.
1922.	Sir William Hearst, K.C.M.G., K.C., LL.D.
1923.	Mr. Ellis H. Wilkinson.
1924.	Mr. William Brooks.
1925.	Rev. Dr. R. N. Burns.
1926.	Colonel A. E. Kirkpatrick, Hon., A.D.C.
1927.	Colonel Alexander Fraser, LL.D., A.D.C.
1928.	Mr. Robert Fennell

HONORARY LIFE MEMBERS :

1904.	Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain.*
1910.	Rt. Hon. Sir George W. Ross, LL.D.*
1920.	Colonel Alexander Fraser, M.A., LL.D., Litt.D.
1924.	Mr. D. J. Goggin, M.A., D.C.L.

---

* Deceased.

APPENDIX III

CONSTITUTION

INSTITUTED 1903

THE OBJECT OF THE CLUB IS THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE INTERESTS OF CANADA AND A UNITED EMPIRE

Organization of the Club and Branches

Art. 1.—(1) The organization shall be called the Empire Club of Canada.

(2) Branches of the Club may be established with the authority of the Executive Committee, and subject to such conditions and regulations as may from time to time be decided upon by the Club in Toronto.

(3) A committee may be appointed under the provisions of sub-section 2, article 1, for the establishment of branches of the Club, and the word "Unit" shall denote a Branch.

Classes of Members

Art. 2.—The Membership of the Club shall be open to any man of the full age of eighteen years who is a British Subject and shall consist of

(a) Active Resident Members,
(b) Non-Resident Members,
(*c*) Life Members,
(*d*) Honorary Members.

Active Resident Members and Non-Resident Members

Art. 3.—(1) Candidates for Membership shall be proposed and seconded by two members of the Club in good standing, and shall be elected by a two-thirds majority of those present at any meeting of the Executive Committee.

(2) Active resident members shall pay an annual fee of $4.00 and non-resident members $3.00, this fee

to include membership obtained after October 15th in any year till December 31st of the following year. Payment of such fee shall entitle each member to receive a copy of the Year Book. No member in arrears for fees or dues shall be considered in good standing or be eligible for office.

Life Members

Art. 4.—(1) Life Members, not exceeding ten in any one year, may be elected from time to time, at an open meeting of the Club, upon the re recommendation of the Executive Committee. Provided, however, that Ministers of the Federal Parliament and Premiers of the different Provinces of the Dominion of Canada may be eligible for election at any time, even though their election may cause the number of Life Members to exceed ten in one year.

(2) Life Members shall pay a fee of $50.00 in one sum.

Honorary Members

Art. 5.(1) Honorary Members may be elected upon the recommendation of the Executive Committee, and at a general meeting of the Club.

(2) Honorary Members shall be exempt from the payment of fees, but shall not have the privilege of voting or holding office.

Officers to be Elected

Art. 6.—(1) The officers of the Club shall consist of an Honorary President; a President; First, Second and Third Vice-President; a Treasurer, a Secretary, or a Secretary-Treasurer; and seventeen other members, all of whom shall be elected by ballot. These members together with the officers before mentioned, shall constitute the Executive Committee, and shall hold office throughout the calendar year. All Past Presidents shall constitute an Advisory Council under the Chairmanship of the immediate Past President, and such

Advisory Council shall elect annually three members, who, together with the retiring President, shall be the ex-officio members of the Executive Committee for the ensuing year.

Election of Officers

(2) The Election of Officers of the Club shall take place at a general meeting of the members, to be held not later than December 15th of each year, at a date to be decided upon by the Executive Committee, and this meeting shall be deemed to be the Annual Meeting. A committee to nominate the officers for the new year shall be appointed at the meeting next preceding such Annual Meeting, due notice of such meeting to be given to all members in good standing, and such committee shall report to the Annual Meeting; provided that no member shall be nominated to any office unless and until he has given notice in writing that he consents to such nomination and will act if elected to the position for which he has been nominated.

(3) Two Auditors shall be elected at each Annual Meeting.

Standing Committees

(4) Standing Committees shall be appointed as follows :—

(*a*) Finance Committee.
(*b*) Speakers' Committee.
(*c*) Membership Committee.
(*d*) Constitution Committee.
(*e*) Luncheon and Reception Committee.
(*f*) Publicity Committee.
(*g*) Royal Colonial Institute Committee.

Filling of Vacancies Among Officers

Art. 7.—In the event of an office becoming vacant by death, resignation, or otherwise, the vacancy thus caused shall be filled by the Executive Committee and the person so chosen shall hold office until the next Annual Meeting.

Duties of Officers

Art. 8.—The duties of the officers shall be those customary to such positions in similar organizations.

Holding of Meetings

Art. 9.—(1) The Club shall hold general meetings weekly from October to May, both inclusive, in each twelve months with such intermissions as from time to time may be decided upon.

(2) At the Annual Meeting a report of the year's proceedings and work shall be submitted by the President, and this report shall be accompanied by an interim report from the Treasurer. As the financial year does not end until December 31st, the Treasurer shall, in addition to the interim report presented at the Annual Meeting, present an audited statement of the finances of the Club for the full financial year at a regular meeting of the Club held during the month of January.

Notice of Meetings.

Art. 10.—Written or printed notices of all meetings shall be given to the members of the Club. Such notices shall be sufficient if addressed to the members, and deposited post paid in the post office in Toronto.

Quorum at Meetings

Art. 11.—Fifteen members in good standing shall constitute a quorum at any meeting of the Club, general, annual or special and the presiding officer shall have a casting vote. Six members shall form a quorum of the Executive Committee.

Limitation of Business at General Meetings

Art. 12.—No business other than the hearing of the addresses and notices of motion shall be introduced at any meeting of the Club, unless it has been submitted to the Executive Committee and received its approval.

Calling of Special Meetings

Art. 13.—Meetings of the Executive Committee shall be called by the President, or on a requisition signed by three of its members. Special meetings of the Club may be called by the President, and shall be called by him on a requisition signed by twelve members and stating the object of the meeting. This object shall be stated in the notice calling the special meeting.

Financial Year

Art. 14.—The Financial Year shall be the same as the calendar year, *viz.* : January first to December thirty-first.

Amendments to Constitution

Art. 15.—This Constitution may be amended at the Annual Meeting, or at a special meeting called for that purpose, subject to a two-thirds majority vote of the members present.